DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 101 VT 008 900

AUTHOR	Roberts, Chester F.
TITLE	Rehabilitative Influences in California Youth Conservation Camps. Phase 2: Staff Policies and Ward Reactions.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of the Youth Authority, Sacramento.
REPORT NO	RR-54
PUB DATE	19 Apr 68
NOTE	112p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.70
DESCRIPTORS	Adjustment (to Environment), *Administrative Policy, Attitudes, *Delinquent Rehabilitation, Delinquents, Institutional Environment, *Manpower Development, *Reactive Behavior, Rehabilitation Programs, *Staff Orientation, Youth Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*California Youth Conservation Camps

ABSTRACT

To define factors associated with administrative policy and staff orientation and to examine ward responses and reactions to these factors, data were gathered by several techniques from wards and staff in two selected study camps. Although wide variations in staff orientation and administrative policy characterized the camps, no significant differences were found for ward parole violation. There was a high correlation between ward in-camp attitudes and reactions and differences in staff orientation and administrative policy. Data from interviews with administrative personnel and non-administrative staff questionnaires revealed wide differences between camps with respect to camp treatment goals, patterns of staff/ward relations, rule and regulation enforcement, counseling and treatment practice, and attitudes toward job. Similarly, ward questionnaires revealed equally wide between-camp differences in attitudes toward camp staff and programs. Although between-camp differences are related to in-camp ward adjustment and attitude, there is no evidence that these differences influence postrelease rehabilitation. Phase 1 of the study is VT 011 192. (SB)

ED041101

Rehabilitative Influences

in California Youth Conservation Camps

Phase 2: Staff Policies and Ward Reactions

By CHESTER F. ROBERTS

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

VT008900

RESEARCH REPORT NO. **54**

April 19, 1968

State of California

RONALD REAGAN
governor

Youth and Adult Corrections Agency

SPENCER WILLIAMS
administrator

Department of the Youth Authority

ALLEN F. BREED
director

GEORGE SALEEBEY
deputy director

KEITH S. GRIFFITHS
Chief of Research

ROBERT F. BEVERLY
Senior Social
Research Analyst

CHESTER F. ROBERTS JR.
Associate Social
Research Analyst

ED041101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

SUMMARY i

INTRODUCTION 1
  Recapitulation 1
  Objectives of the Present Report 2
  The Study Camp Samples 2
  Sources of Data 6

STAFF ATTITUDES AND WARD REACTIONS 10
  Organization of the Analysis 10

Camp Goals 11
  The Viewpoint of Administrators 12
  Staff Questionnaire Responses 13
  Ward Reaction 15
  Evaluation 16

Desirable Staff Characteristics 17
  Viewpoint of Administrators 17
  Staff Questionnaire Responses 19
  Evaluation 21

Youth Authority - Forestry Relations 22
  The Viewpoints of Administrators 24
  Staff Questionnaire Responses 27
  Ward Reactions 27
  Evaluation 29

Staff-Ward Relations 30
  Viewpoint of Administrators 30
  Staff Questionnaire Responses 31
  Ward Reactions 32
  Evaluation 35

Rules and Regulations 36
  Viewpoint of Administrators 36
  Staff Questionnaire Responses 38
  Ward Reactions 39
  Evaluation 41

Counseling and Treatment 42
  Viewpoints of Administrators 42
  Staff Questionnaire Responses 44
  Ward Reactions 45
  Evaluation 47

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

PAGE NO.

Therapeutic Benefits of the Camp Program........................ 49
  Viewpoint of Administrators........................ 49
  Staff Questionnaire Responses........................ 51
  Ward Reactions........................ 51
  Evaluation........................ 52

Assessment of Ward Progress........................ 53
  Viewpoint of Administrators........................ 53
  Staff Questionnaire........................ 55
  Ward Reactions........................ 56
  Evaluation........................ 58

Overview........................ 58

GENERAL WARD ATTITUDES TOWARD CAMP AND SELF EXPECTATIONS........................ 61
  Attitude Toward Camp Scale........................ 61
  Differences in Ward Reactions to Camp........................ 62
  Perception of Program Value Scale........................ 66
  Differences in Ward Perceptions of Program Value........................ 66

STAFF EVALUATIONS OF WARD STATUS AND INFLUENCE AMONG PEERS........................ 68

THE CAMP MILIEUX, WARD REACTIONS AND PAROLE REVOCATION........................ 73
  The 1963 Camps Parole Cohort........................ 74
  The Periodic Samples........................ 75
  Parole Violation and Michigan Questionnaire Responses........................ 78
  Parole Violation and the Two Attitude Scales........................ 78
  Parole Violation and Staff Ratings........................ 79

CONCLUSION........................ 80

APPENDIX A........................ 83

APPENDIX B........................ 86

APPENDIX C........................ 93

APPENDIX D........................ 100

APPENDIX E........................ 104

BIBLIOGRAPHY........................ 105

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NO.		PAGE NO.
1	Characteristics of Study Samples, Camp Carson..............	4
2	Characteristics of Study Samples, Camp Drake...............	5
3	General Ward Attitudes Toward Camp, Camp Carson and Camp Drake, February and November...........................	63
4	Attitude Toward Camp and Ethnic Background, Camp Carson and Camp Drake, February and November, 1963.................	65
5	Perceptions of Program Value vs. Attitude Toward Camp, Camp Carson and Camp Drake, February and November Samples....................................	67
6	Intercorrelations Among Three Staff Rating Variables, February and May Samples............................	70
7	Staff Ratings of Peer Status, Peer Influence and Delinquent Orientation by Attitude Toward Camp and Perception of Program Value, Camp Carson and Camp Drake, February Sample.....................................	71
8	Parole Violation Rates of Camp Parolees, 1962 and 1963 Cohorts....................................	74
9	Parole Violation Rates for Parolees Among the February, May and November Samples at Camp Carson and Camp Drake, 1963..	76
10	Violation Rates and Camp Staff Ratings on Peer Status, Peer Influence and Delinquency Orientation for the February and May Samples, Camp Carson and Camp Drake...............	79

SUMMARY

No significant differences in parole violation rate were found for wards released from two selected study camps, although wide variations in staff orientation and administrative philosophy were found to characterize each of the camps. The in-camp attitudes and reactions of wards were found to be highly correlated to differences in staff orientation and administrative philosophy, however.

On the basis of data obtained from interviews with upper echelon administrative personnel at each camp, and opinion and attitude questionnaires completed by non-administrative staff personnel, wide differences with respect to such items as camp treatment goals, patterns of staff-ward relations, rule and regulation enforcement, counselling and treatment practice, and attitudes toward job were found between the two camps. These differences appeared to range along a continuum, with one of the camps (Camp Carson) oriented toward a controlled-guidance and work training type of program, in contrast to a permissive-interpersonal and therapeutic community orientation at the other camp (Camp Drake).

Analyses of ward questionnaires revealed equally wide between-camp differences in ward attitudes toward camp staff and programs. Camp Carson wards indicated relatively negative attitudes and Camp Drake wards showed strongly positive and appreciative attitudes. However, when differences in ward response to the respective camp programs were evaluated in terms of post-release rehabilitation as measured by gross recidivism rates following fifteen months of parole exposure, no substantial between-camp differences were found.

It was concluded that although formal between-camp differences in program orientation are related to the in-camp adjustment and attitude of wards, there

is no evidence to justify the assumption that such differences influence the post-release rehabilitation of wards.

INTRODUCTION

This is the second of several reports to be published under the general title: Rehabilitative Influences in California Youth Conservation Camps. The theoretic framework of the overall study sees positive rehabilitative change among juvenile offenders as a consequence of the interaction between elements of the "camp milieu" and complementary factors in the socio-psychological make-up (self) of the wards (3; p. 3ff). The general design of the study seeks to: 1) identify and define elements, both in the camp milieux and in the background characteristics and socio-psychological responses of the wards, which are related to their adjustment on parole, and to 2) examine the interrelationships between these two sets of variables.

Recapitulation. In the first report of this series, subtitled: The California Youth Conservation Camps and Their Wards, a general review was presented of the backgrounds and programs of the four main camps operated by the California Youth Authority (CYA) and the California Division of Forestry. An analysis was made of the major personal and background characteristics of the wards in those camps during the years 1962 and 1963. A number of consistent differences were found between the total camp population for each year and the comparable Youth Authority population 16-years-of-age and over in other CYA facilities, relative to age, court of commitment, ethnic background, region of commitment and commitment offense. Consistent and significant difference in background variables were also found to differentiate certain camps from the others. A comparison of parole violation rates of wards released from each of the four camps in 1962 failed to show any significant differences between the camps, although the data did suggest that certain categories of wards (defined by certain personal characteristics) tended to show significantly positive or negative post-release parole performance when released from certain camps, when compared with the parole performance of similar wards released from other camps or with other categories of wards released from the same camp.

Objectives of the Present Report. This report, on the second phase of the overall study, is intended to: 1) define certain general camp milieu factors in two selected study camps, Camp Carson and Camp Drake,[1] which are associated with the administrative policy and staff orientation of the two camps, and 2) to examine ward responses and reactions to these factors.

A number of studies (2, 4, 5) during the past few years have accentuated the relationship between staff attitudes and ward reactions in an institutional setting. They have pointed out the effects of ambiguous or conflicting administrative policy on staff effectiveness, and have evaluated the effects of differential modes of institutional philosophy on ward adjustment, both within the institution and on parole. The generalized findings of these studies will serve as an analytic framework for identifying relevant staff-related factors impinging upon wards in the two camp milieux.

The Study Camp Samples. For the purposes of this and future reports, two different types of samplings of the wards in the two study camps during 1963 were made. The first set of periodic samplings is composed of all wards in Camp Carson on February 12, May 21 and November 5, 1963; and all wards in the Camp Drake main camp on February 8, May 17 and November 14, 1963. The second set of samplings is composed of four groups of about 20 wards each, at each camp, who were admitted to camp between late December, 1962, and mid-June, 1963, and who were not scheduled for early release from the camps (in less than three months). For the purposes of the present report, the latter samplings will be combined for each camp and termed the "Panel". The major background characteristics and the proportional distribution of wards among their categories are shown for each of these two types of samplings, as well as for the entire 1963 release cohort, for each camp are shown in Tables 1 and 2:

---

[1] The two camps selected for comparison will hereafter be known as "Camp Carson" and "Camp Drake" in order to focus the analysis upon the generalized milieux typified by the two camps, rather than the personalities and known specifics involved in the actual camp settings.

Table 1

Characteristics of Study Samples, Camp Carson

Characteristics	1963 Release Cohort	Panel	February	May	November
N (100 %)	221	81	64	78	68
Age of Release					
17 & Under	23.1	24.7	15.6	28.2	22.1
18-19	51.2	54.3	64.1	50.0	42.6
20 & Over	25.7	21.0	20.3	21.8	35.3
Court of Commitment					
Juvenile	42.1	46.9	43.7	48.7	36.8
Criminal	57.9	53.1	56.3	51.3	63.2
Ethnic Background					
Caucasian	51.6	50.6	39.1[a]	47.4	50.0
Negro	28.0	23.4	39.1	24.4	29.4
Mex.-Amer./Other	20.4	26.0	21.8	28.2	20.6
Region of Commitment					
Southern Calif.	42.1	43.2	41.0	38.5	50.0
Central Valley	33.0	37.0	32.0	41.0	26.5
Bay Area/Other	24.9	19.8	27.0	20.5	23.5
Admission Status					
First Admission	61.5	54.3	59.4	57.7	69.1
Readmission	38.5	45.7	40.6	42.3	30.9
Type of Offense					
Category III	63.3	63.0	60.9	61.5	60.3
Categories VII-VIII	22.2	17.3	21.9	16.7	29.4
Other Categories	14.5	19.7	17.2	21.8	10.3
Type of Region					
Metropolitan	-	42.0	50.0	38.5	50.0
Urban	-	27.2	26.6	26.9	16.2
Semi-urban	-	28.4	17.2	30.8	25.0
Rural	-	2.4	6.2	3.8	8.8
Type of Release					
Parole	76.5	85.2	92.2	93.6	86.8
Non-parole	23.5	14.8	7.8	6.4	13.2

[a] Overall proportions significantly different from the 1963 release cohort, $P < .05$.

Table 2

Characteristics of Study Samples, Camp Drake

Characteristics	1963 Release Cohort	Panel	February	May	November
N (100%)	244	82	59	80	80
Age of Release					
17 & Under	20.9	15.8	18.6	13.8	15.0
18-19	49.2	48.8	50.9	50.0	52.5
20 & Over	29.9	35.4	30.5	36.2	32.5
Court of Commitment					
Juvenile	38.9	32.9	35.6	35.0	38.8
Criminal	61.1	67.1	64.4	65.0	61.2
Ethnic Background					
Caucasian	61.1	58.5	54.2[a]	60.0	55.0
Negro	22.1	25.6	35.6	26.2	28.8
Mex.-Amer./Other	16.8	15.9	10.2	13.8	16.2
Region of Commitment					
Southern Calif.	40.6	43.9	39.0	50.0	40.0
Central Valley	27.4	22.0	30.5	21.2	31.2
Bay Area/Other	32.0	34.1	30.5	28.8	28.8
Admission Status					
First Admission	67.6	69.5	64.4	68.8	62.5
Readmission	32.4	30.5	35.6	31.2	37.5
Type of Offense					
Category III	66.4	67.1	64.4	65.0	68.8
Categories VII-VIII	22.5	19.5	22.0	22.5	21.2
Other Categories	11.1	13.4	13.6	12.5	10.0
Type of Region					
Metropolitan	-	45.1	50.8	48.8	42.5
Urban	-	17.1	22.0	17.5	16.2
Semi-urban	-	17.1	13.6	15.0	18.8
Rural	-	20.7	13.6	18.7	22.5
Type of Release					
Parole	79.1	81.7	89.8	87.5	96.2
Non-parole	20.9	18.3	10.2	12.5	3.8

---

[a] Overall proportions significantly different from the 1963 release cohort, $P < .05$.

In only two instances (Ethnic Background among the February sample at both camps) are there any statistically significant ($P < .05$) differences between the characteristics proportions for any one of the periodic samples or the panel, and the respective camp resident[2] cohorts. Otherwise each of the camp panels and periodic samples would appear to closely reflect their respective camps' 1963 release cohort in terms of the eight characteristics shown. Even these significant differences would not seem sufficient to seriously refute the general representativeness of the various samples.

Sources of Data. Several data gathering and measuring techniques were used in relation both to the ward samples at each camp and the camp staff. Work records, special incident reports, and adjustment evaluations were gathered for each of the wards in the samples. Intensive interviews with a number of the wards on the camp panels were conducted, both at time of entry to the camp and just prior to release. Panel wards were also administered the Reckless-Eynon Institutional Impact Questionnaire (see Appendix D), consisting of 60 items organized around six scalar dimensions: Interpersonal Approach, Inmate Code, Rejection of Institution, Inmate Pressure, Rejection of Positive Impact and Self-Labeling. This questionnaire was administered immediately following each Panel ward's entry to camp and, when possible, just prior to his release. The February and November periodic samples were administered a revised version of a questionnaire developed by Vinter and Janowitz (4, p. 735) at the University of Michigan to study ward reactions to staff policy and administration (see Appendix C). Wards of all three periodic samples were administered a sociometric questionnaire asking them to name 1) three wards who helped other wards in camp, 2) three wards they would most like to see represent them on a camp council, and 3) three wards who were their closest friends. Finally, each ward in each camp was rated by staff members on three dimensions: peer-group status, peer-group influence and delinquency orientation (see Appendix E). Additional data on each ward was obtained from their case file folders and various record forms maintained by the Youth Authority and described in the Y.A. Data Processing System Manuel. (1) It should be remembered that some wards were in a Panel only, others were in the periodic samples only, and a few were in both the Panel and in one or more periodic samples. Thus considerably more data is available upon some wards than upon others.[3]

---

[2] The "resident" cohort at each camp includes all wards in that camp during 1963, i.e., the 1963 release cohort plus all wards still in camp on December 31, 1963. At both camps, only the residents in the main camp are considered as subjects for this phase of the study; wards assigned to Spike camps are not included. See Appendix A.

Two types of data were gathered relative to staff orientation and attitude: Intensive interviews were conducted with the four top administrators of each camp: (Youth Authority Superintendent, Forestry Superintendent, Assistant Y.A. Superintendent and the Senior Group Supervisor). A lengthy interview schedule which structured the order of questions similarly for each person, yet allowed considerable latitude both in probing and in eliciting meaningful responses was used. In addition, a five-page questionnaire was given to each non-administrative staff member (this included Senior Group Supervisors) to be filled out anonymously and returned by mail (see Appendix B). About 90 percent (23) of the staff questionnaires were returned from Camp Drake, but only about 50 percent (11) were returned from Camp Carson.

---

[3] For additional detail on the various samplings used in this study see Appendix A.

This abundance of data, and the indices and scale scores derived from them, form the basis of the analyses both in this and the succeeding phases of the study. The present phase is concerned primarily with ward responses to certain selected items from the Michigan and the Reckless-Eynon questionnaires, with excerpts from the administrator interviews, with responses to the staff questionnaire and with the staff ratings of ward delinquency orientation, peer status and peer influence.

In the interpretations to be made of the data, three points should be kept in mind at all times:

1) Current vogue in criminological and sociological usage has tended to attach particular value to certain terms and their associated practices. Thus, "treatment" is valued as "good", while "custody" is valued as "less good". Unfortunately, there are no non-valued synonyms available to replace such items. In the analyses to be presented it should be understood, therefore, that when a particular camp is described as being "custody-oriented", no implication of this being better or worse than being "treatment-oriented" is to be read into the statement. What is described are only two different modes of operational emphasis, each of which might well be the most appropriate mode for that particular facility under the particular conditions which it faces.

2) The comparisons which are made in the following analyses are at all times relative rather than absolute. To use the above example, when it is stated that one camp is "custody-oriented" while the other is "treatment-oriented" there is no intention of implying any extreme division in orientation between the two camps. Rather

in the absence of any general standard for comparison, what is described are general tendencies at each camp in comparison to the other. Thus, each camp may contain elements which are "custodial" and others which are "treatment", yet a relatively greater emphasis upon one element may exist at one camp, and upon the other element at the other camp. How distinctly different in degree each camp is from the other cannot be determined from the data used, only that a difference in a particular direction appears to exist.

3) The responses to questions on a pencil-and-paper form or in an interview may, or may not, be valid and reliable expressions of the individual's true feelings concerning the subject matter of the question. Without other criteria, which are lacking in this study, there is no way of evaluating the motivation for any particular answers or set of answers. Thus one person may respond in a particular way because he actually feels that way about the subject, while another may answer similarly because he feels that any other answer may get him into trouble. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that the answers presented in the data to follow are necessarily true attitudes of the respondents, they are merely responses. Where, however, a number of people in a particular situation tend to agree upon the nature of the responses they give, it may fairly safely be assumed that there is a common motivational factor operative among them. It is this communality which is important in the following analyses, not the overt content of the responses themselves. Thus, where there are wide differences in the

way in which the wards at one camp respond to a question in comparison to the way in which the wards at the other camp respond to the same question, the difference may be a reflection of the way the wards at camp really feel, or it might only indicate that wards at one camp felt it to be more propitious to answer a particular way, regardless of their real feelings. Both groups of wards may actually feel the same way, in the latter case, but the fact that the wards at one camp felt compelled to answer differently is an important indication of a differential reaction, even if undefined, toward the milieux of the two camps.

STAFF ATTITUDES AND WARD REACTIONS

Organization of the Analysis: The following analysis is divided into eight topical categories: 1) Camp Goals, 2) Desirable Staff Characteristics, 3) Y.A. - Forestry Relations, 4) Staff - Ward Relations, 5) Rule and Regulations, 6) Counseling and Treatment Practices, 7) Therapeutic Benefits, and 8) Assessment of Ward Progress. These eight topical categories were derived from a preliminary examination of the data as well as a review of similar studies conducted elsewhere. For each category an introductory section will define the scope of the category and review previous literature on the topic. This will be followed by a presentation of representative viewpoints from the interviews with administrators at each camp. Staff responses to questionnaire items relevant to the topic will then be presented and administrator-staff concurrence or divergence upon each topic will be examined. Then, ward reactions, as expressed in questionnaire responses, will be related to the staff orientations. Each section will end with a general evaluation of staff orientation and ward reaction as related to each topic.

Camp Goals

What are the general goals which are to serve as the focus for camp operations, as distinct from the actual practices? What is it that is expected to be achieved? Possible answers might range from simply "getting useful manpower for necessary forestry tasks", to "keeping wards in custody away from their home communities", to "providing a therapeutic community environment for rehabilitative purposes".

Some previous studies have shown that consensus or divergence as to the ranking of different goals, between administrators and operational staff, between different staff groupings, and between wards and staff, exercise a strong influence over staff morale, decision-making and ward reactions to staff requirements. Vinter and Janowitz (3; pp. 198, 210) define two types of goal orientations which they found among the staffs of the institutions which they studied: "traditional and simple (teaching good habits, and training and education), or modern and complex (changing attitudes and values, and providing self-insight)." They found that "While custody is not a goal in itself, when it is presented as an alternative to treatment, the support is apparent for custodial policies in those institutions whose official goals are of the simple, traditional type." (Ibid, p. 210) They also found greater consensus concerning goals "where the traditional goals were emphasized, and disagreement increased as proportions of staff inclined toward the 'self-insight' end of the goal alternatives." (Ibid, p. 211) In all types of institutions, "the executive core was less likely to emphasize custodial policies than other staff." (Ibid, p. 212) Ward attitudes toward self, staff, institutional policies, were found to vary in relation to staff perceptions of primary goals (Ibid, pp. 421, 477 and 504) and differences between the executive core and lower echelon staff were sharpened in the more custodial-oriented institutions. (Ibid, p. 212) Grusky (2), encountered similar findings in his study of treatment goals and organizational behavior in a small camp facility for adult offenders.

The Viewpoints of Administrators

The top administrative core at each camp: Youth Authority Superintendent, Forestry Superintendent, Youth Authority Assistant Superintendent and the Senior Group Supervisor, were asked: "In your judgment, what are the principal goals of the camp program here?" They were also asked to indicate some ranking of the goals named and to remark upon the "more important ways in which the camp goals you stated are being implemented in the daily camp routine." Their replies are given below:[4]

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Goals: The major accent has to be placed on the work program and teaching the kid work habits...to develop these kinds of work habits that will enable him to keep a job when he is released...to learn to live with other people...learn to conform to direction...accept authority...learning to get along with boss and fellow workmen...learning to do the job...instilling of good safe work habits...feeling of responsibility...learning to live with rules...see that the government gets value for the money it spends.	Goals: To have an operation that is ward or client-oriented, rather than staff-oriented...teach a boy that when he goes to work he's got a job to do, to see some value in the job done...perhaps this will have a carry-over effect in the community...we try to teach them skils, try to develop work habits and teach them to accept their own responsibility...how to work along with other people, to listen to the boss man...to think for yourself.
Implementation: We make them work hard--grow up--stand on their own two	Implementation: (By establishing) a benign atmosphere, treatment-oriented...

---

[4] The quotations from interviews are presented verbatim. However, repititions of opinion by the same individual have been eliminated. Under each of the eight topic headings, only statements relevant to the particular topic have been extracted from the total statements of the persons interviewed.

Camp Carson (cont.)

feet, so they can stand the pressure out there on the outside and make a living... we try to give them a little stability by a good hard work program and in their association with staff...Every phase of our program is treatment, whether it be custody or welfare or work. We teach them good clean living habits, some of those that need it.

Camp Drake (cont.)

maintaining a continual evaluation...the group living situation is an impact area... that would include the peer relationships... I think we are kidding ourselves if we think we're going to make any tremendous changes in their basic personality--it's pretty well set before they come to us.

The essential difference between the two camps is to be seen, not in terms of any difference in actual program elements, but rather in the goals which such elements are seen as supporting. At Camp Carson the emphasis is upon direct training and controlled guidance. Learning to "accept", to "conform", to "live with rules" are frequently mentioned. At Camp Drake, on the other hand, the work and counselling aspects of the program are seen as indirect means of encouraging the ward to "see some value in the job done", "to accept their own responsibility", "to think for yourself". In general, the differences seem related to an "other-directed" vs. an "inner-directed" emphasis. That is, at the first camp the wards are expected to learn to accept and to live under social restraint, while at the second camp the goals are more oriented toward encouraging them to voluntarily internalize certain standards of social conduct. The difference would seem to be in some accord with Vinter and Janowitz' "traditional and simple" vs. "modern and complex" distinction.

Staff Questionnaire Responses

Two items in the staff questionnaire asked the staffs to indicate which one of three general orientations came the closest to reflecting 1) their own view of the purpose of the camp, and 2) what they felt to be the camp superintendent's view of the purpose of the camp. The percentage results are shown below for each of the three orientations:

Camp Staff Questionnaire Responses: Goal Orientation

Items	Camp Carson[a]			Camp Drake		
	Total (N-11)	Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Forestry Staff (N-4)	Total (N-23)	Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Forestry Staff (N-8)
Own View:						
Change ward attitudes	36.4	57.2	-	34.8	46.7	12.5
Help wards understand why they got into trouble	18.2	28.5	-	8.7	13.3	-
Teach good work habits	27.3	14.3	25.0	56.5	40.0	87.5
No Answer	18.1	-	75.0	-	-	-
Superintendent's View						
Change ward attitudes	27.3	42.8	-	26.1	33.3	12.5
Help wards understand why they got into trouble	45.4	57.2	25.0	8.7	13.3	-
Teach good work habits	27.3	-	75.0	60.9	46.7	87.5
No Answer	-	-	-	4.3	6.7	-

---

[a] Only about fifty percent of the Camp Carson staff members' questionnaires were returned, in comparison to the 90 percent response of Camp Drake staff members.

Three points of interest stand out in the staff responses: 1) the divergence in goal perceptions between the Y.A. staffs and the Forestry staffs; 2) the differences between the two Y.A. staffs; and 3) the differences between "Own View" and "Superintendent's View". The Forestry staffs at each camp emphasize the work-training orientation to a much greater extent than do the Y.A. staffs. The Camp Carson Y.A. staff tends to minimize the work-training orientation much more than does the Camp Drake staff and to emphasize the self-evaluation orientation much more than does the Camp Drake staff. At both camps the Y.A. staffs tend to attribute a somewhat different orientation to the camp superintendent than they hold for themselves, thus Camp Carson staff saw attitude change as the primary goal, but felt that the superintendent favored the self-evaluation approach, while at Camp Drake the staff felt that the superintendent was slightly more interested in work training and somewhat less interested in attitude change than they. Both Forestry staffs, on the other hand, indicate rather close agreement between their own view and that which they attribute to their superintendent.

Ward Reaction

Only one item in the Michigan questionnaire administered to the February and November samples seemed to relate to goal perception. Ward responses to this item by percentage for each sample by camp are shown below:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses:[5]
Camp Goals

Items	Camp Carson February (N-64)	Camp Carson November (N-66)[a]	Camp Drake February (N-58)	Camp Drake November (N-80)[a]
19.[b] What do you think about this place? Is it --				
A place that helps boys in trouble?	39.1	39.3	65.5	64.9
A place to send boys who get into trouble?	26.6	28.8	15.5	18.8
A place to punish boys for something wrong they did?	34.3	25.8	17.3	13.8
No answer:	-	6.1	1.7	2.5

---

[a] Two wards in the Camp Carson sample in November, and one ward in each of the Camp Drake samples did not receive questionnaires and were therefore omitted from this and other Michigan questionnaire tables.

[b] Hereafter, the number before each of the Michigan questionnaire items is that assigned to it in the original questionnaire.

---

[5] Here, as in other presentations to be made of responses to the Michigan and to the Eynon questionnaire, the writer has taken the liberty of eliminating needless verbiage contained in the original items (see Appendixes C and D for original form) and has, where clarity or great discrimination of responses indicates, combined similar responses, i.e., the original responses "Good" and "Very Good" may be combined into a single response category for reporting purposes.

The similarity of response patterns between the two samples within each camp is apparent, indicating the stability of response over time. Camp Drake appeared much more likely to perceive their camp as a place to "help" boys than did Camp Carson wards, while the latter were much more likely to see their camp as a place of punishment, or custody and control.

Evaluation

The above analyses present an overall picture of rather wide differences in administrator and staff perceptions of primary goals for each camp and of differences in ward reactions. The staff questionnaire responses tend to support the concept of the Camp Carson camp program as more "traditional and simple" and the Camp Drake orientation as more "modern and complex" along the Vinter and Janowitz continuum, even though there appears to be some divergence between the staff's "Own View" and that which they perceive as the "Superintendent's View" specifically. It would seem, however, that the real difference between the camps on goal orientation is not so much between custody vs. treatment, or work program vs. social interaction, etc., as between differing degrees of emphasis along a permissiveness-controlled guidance continuum. Both camps tend to emphasize the work-training aspects of their program, custody does not appear more severe at either camp, treatment and counselling are found at both camps. Both Y.A. staffs assign top priority to the goal of changing attitudes, but, particularly in the Administrator's statements, at Camp Carson these activities and goals tend to be seen in terms of guidance, overseeing, controlling, training, etc., while at Camp Drake the goals and practices are commented upon in terms of permissive program in a "benign atmosphere" with "continual evaluation", "peer relationships", "own responsibility", "aiding wards in decision-making", etc.

In this respect, the reactions of the wards are about as would be anticipated from previous studies of institutional impact: the wards tended to see the permissive milieu as a place that "helps boys" and the controlled guidance milieu as a place to "send" or "punish boys". Additional effects of this basic goal orientation divergency will also be seen in some of the subsequent analyses.

Desirable Staff Characteristics

What is the nature of the staffs at the two camps? What characteristics do they have in common? How do they differ? What are perceived as the ideal characteristics by administrators? It was felt that differences in staff goal orientations and staff attitudes might be related to actual differences between the staffs on other variables. Vinter and Janowitz (4, p. 212) found that perception of goals was affected by degree of education. Vinter and Lind (5, p. 35ff) have noted that differences in operating policy among staff were related to self-image, morale and job satisfaction.

Viewpoint of Administrators

The administrative group members at each camp were asked to cite the qualities which they felt were most desirable in selecting a person for employment as a supervisor or forestry foreman. They were also asked to point out those characteristics which they felt were undesirable, and the type of background and training which they felt a good supervisor or foreman should have. They were finally asked to evaluate their present staff in terms of adequacy of training and competency.

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Desirable Qualities: The "Leader type", who wants and will get his way ...strength of personality that will be able to dominate the group... aggressive...some force to his speech or his manner...solid character...concern for young boys...honesty and sincerity ...enthusiasm for this kind of work.	Desirable Qualities: Ability to reason...to analyze situations...able to out-think the kids...interest in the ward - and dedication...mature enough and secure enough that they don't have to take their feelings out on the kids ...stable man, a family man...loyal, dependable and honest.
Undesirable Qualities: Weakness is one thing to avoid -- boys will very soon spot this person...these ambition guys who are popping up with new ideas all the time (and) keep the kids so confused they won't know which the hell way is up ...these real stable guys that like to do things like they were done 20 years ago...you need some of both.	Undesirable Qualities: Sour-grapes type of person, nothing is ever right for them...the person who doesn't want to work with kids...the star-gazers who don't have any conception of what they're letting themselves into, the person who is not able to perceive situations and follow instructions, a person who is sickly...and a person who is not too bright...people who boast a lot, throw up a big phony front of their abilities and background.
Background: Education in the social sciences quite often is a handicap... retired military people...varied experience ...has knocked around...has held a variety of jobs...man who has had standards of workmanship established for himself... Good salesman can sell the good life to these kids. Education is important - if he has some of the other things that go along with it, too...supervisory experience...we need more diversification of trained people with skills in different types of work.	Background: The man who is just going into this field out of college, who would be looking for experience for one or two years and then move out to become a parole agent...you need some, however, who are older, stable men... There's a real untapped resource in the retired military...actual experience in dealing with other people seems important...Some of the best staff are coming from the field of selling...I am suspicious of persons with a lot of law enforcement background, they won't be accepted by the boys.
Present Staff: We have some staff who have been here a long time and they're not progressive thinkers...a number of staff think in terms of ease of supervision...We have a staff that does not have a high education level.	Present Staff: Our staff has grown pretty much as a unit...Generally speaking, we have a staff that is doing the job we want them to be doing...you run into many problems with supervisors that are either too control conscious or too treatment conscious.

In general the administrators at both camps seem to feel that they have about the types of staff they would like, although the administrators at Camp Carson tend to be more critical of their staff for not being "progressive thinkers" and not having a "high educational level". The Camp Carson administrators tend to emphasize such qualities as "strength of personality", "able to dominate", "aggressive", etc., while the Camp Drake administrators stress such qualities as "ability to reason", "able to out-think the kids", "experience in dealing with other people", etc., as ideals in selecting counselors. Camp Drake administrators seemed to picture adaptability as a significant quality, while viewing the position of counselor as only a stepping-stone, or temporary plateau, in a continuing career. Camp Carson administrators, on the other hand, stress stability and seem to see the counselor position as the culmination of a varied career in "different types of work".

Staff Questionnaire Responses

Three items in the staff questionnaire dealt with such personal characteristics as age, education and marital status. Two items were concerned with attitudes toward their job and toward the camp program. The percentage distributions for these items are shown below:

Camp Staff Questionnaire Responses:
Staff Characteristics

Items	Camp Carson Total (N-11)	Camp Carson Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Camp Carson Forestry Staff (N-4)	Camp Drake Total (N-23)	Camp Drake Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Camp Drake Forestry Staff (N-8)
Age:						
Under 25	18.2	28.6	-	21.7	13.3	37.5
25-39	45.4	42.8	50.0	47.8	46.7	50.0
40-54	18.2	28.6	-	17.4	26.7	-
55 and over	9.1	-	25.0	13.1	13.3	12.5
No answer	9.1	-	25.0	-	-	-
Education:						
10-11 years	9.1	-	25.0	4.4	-	12.5
H.S. graduate	72.7	85.8	50.0	43.5	46.8	37.5
1-3 years college	9.1	14.2	-	43.5	40.0	50.0
College graduate	9.1	-	25.0	8.6	13.2	-

Camp Staff Questionnaire Responses:
Staff Characteristics
(cont)

Items	Camp Carson Total (N-11)	Camp Carson Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Camp Carson Forestry Staff (N-4)	Camp Drake Total (N-23)	Camp Drake Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Camp Drake Forestry Staff (N-8)
Marital Status:						
Single	54.5	57.1	50.0	4.4	6.6	-
Married	36.4	28.6	50.0	73.9	66.7	87.5
No answer	9.1	14.3	-	21.7	26.7	12.5
Satisfaction with chances for career advancement:						
Satisfied	72.8	85.8	50.0	65.3	53.4	87.5
Less than satisfied	27.2	14.2	50.0	21.7	33.3	-
Don't care / No answer	-	-	-	13.0	13.3	12.5
Present camp program about as good as can be:						
Agree	-	-	-	17.3	13.4	25.0
Disagree	81.8	85.7	75.0	65.4	59.9	75.0
Unsure / No answer	18.2	14.3	25.0	17.3	26.7	-

Differences between the responses of the staff members from the two camps are indicated to some degree for nearly every item. The Camp Carson Y.A. staff tended to be somewhat younger, less well educated, more likely to be single, more satisfied with their chances for advancement and less accepting of the present camp program than were the Y.A. staff members at Camp Drake. The Forestry staff at Camp Carson, on the other hand, tended to be older, less well educated, less satisfied with career advancement opportunities and less satisfied with the camp program than were their colleagues at Camp Drake.

The two attitude items seem to indicate a basic orientation between the two staffs along what might be considered an inclusive-exclusive dimension:

Camp Staff Questionnaire Responses:
Staff Attitudes

Items	Camp Carson Total (N-11)	Camp Carson Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Camp Carson Forestry Staff (N-4)	Camp Drake Total (N-23)	Camp Drake Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Camp Drake Forestry Staff (N-8)
Would volunteers from the community be helpful?						
Would be helpful	18.2	28.6	-	65.3	73.4	50.0
May often create problems	81.8	71.4	100.0	30.4	20.0	50.0
No answer	-	-	-	4.3	6.6	-
Should more boys be eligible for camp?						
More	72.7	85.7	50.0	69.6	66.7	75.0
About same	18.2	-	50.0	30.4	33.3	25.0
Fewer	9.1	14.3	-	-	-	-

The responses of the two camp staffs on these two items may be less a reflection of personal attitude than of previous experience with camp-community relations or present conditions at the camp. It is quite apparent, however, that the Camp Drake staff is far more willing than is the Camp Carson staff to extend the program to include community volunteers. This might be taken as an indication of a greater willingness upon the part of the Camp Drake staff to experiment with different program innovations, or, perhaps, a reluctance upon the part of the Camp Carson staff to accept "outside amateurs" in a quasi-professional role. Remarkably little difference between the two camp staffs was obtained upon the second item.

Evaluation

Three other essential differences between the two camp staffs should be pointed out: 1) at the time the staff questionnaire was administered, Camp Drake had been in operation just slightly more than two years, while Camp Carson had been in operation more than 15 years; 2) as a result, the staff at Camp Carson tended to be composed of counselors who had been associated with that camp for some time, while the staff at Camp Drake were either recently employed or had been transferred to Camp Drake from other facilities, and 3) the superintendent at Camp Carson, to a considerable extent, inherited his staff from his predecessors, while the superintendent at Camp Drake had been able to select personnel who more closely reflected his own thinking concerning camp goals and methods of camp operation and orientation.

Vinter and Janowitz' findings concerning a relation between education level and goal orientation would seem to be confirmed in terms of the two camp staffs, while the item concerning satisfaction with chances for career advancement would seem in accord with the Vinter and Lind finding of differential job satisfaction in relation to goal orientation, with the more treatment-oriented camp evincing somewhat less satisfaction, particularly among Youth Authority staff members.

Youth Authority - Forestry Relations

The California Youth Conservation camps are operated under dual administration with parallel staffing by the Department of the Youth Authority and the Department of Conservation, Division of Forestry. The Forestry staff's essential assignment is to utilize the wards toward the ends of the conservation and control of natural resources; the Youth Authority's primary goal is the utilization of the program of work toward the conservation and control of a human resource -- the wards themselves. The Forestry staff is responsible for determining and overseeing the forestry conservation tasks to be performed; the Y.A. staff determines crew assignments of wards and is responsible for their welfare and security. To a considerable extent the work of the two staffs overlap. Thus, Forestry foremen often function as counselors to the wards, and Youth Authority staff often direct forestry activities in the woods and on fire-lines. This dualism and division of functions and goals within the camp can be an important affective element in the camp milieu, depending upon the personalities of the principals involved in each administration.

Weber (6, p. 835) points out that camps operating under the "divided model" generally have

> serious difficulty in coordinating the various aspects of total programs and focusing it on the delinquent boys in the most helpful way...The divided organization stimulated difficulties, particularly among the boys who tended to act out and discharge their problems in the setting in which they found themselves. The various units of the organization were required to give a disproportionate amount of time to solving these difficulties. In the meantime, the boys who did not express their problems in this direct manner received too little attention...Since each boy had to adapt himself to his place in the camp, each separate division within the organization meant an additional adaptation that he had to make.

Problems of administrative and inter-staff conflict can arise at a number of points in such a dual administration. For instance, the Forestry Superintendent's primary concern is in conservation activities, the Youth Authority Superintendent's is in ward rehabilitation. To the extent, therefore, that either feels that his primary interest is being subordinated to the demands of the other department, a position of resistance and tension is likely to result. Relatively minor matters, such as the differential treatment each staff receives from its controlling agency, in terms of pay benefits, overtime repayment and duty hours, will tend to arouse resentment directed at the members of the more-favored staff. Since wards are in close contact with members of both staffs, particularly during working hours, their perceptions of their own relations with staff members will tend to be colored by any overt evidence of divisiveness or antagonism.

The Viewpoints of the Administrators

The Youth Authority and Forestry administrators were asked to comment upon: 1) any problems between the two staffs; and 2) the relationship of Forestry foremen with wards:

Camp Carson

Interstaff Problems: Some very severe administrative problems exist ...communication, except on a social kind of basis, is almost non-existent ...there used to be an idea of mutual consent and agreement, but this has gone down the drain...conflicting policies have been detrimental.

The real problem is that basically (the two superintendents) are rather violently opposed in their viewpoint on both the purpose and the criteria for giving certain grades... (forestry) feels unless a kid produces at the level of a full-time paid employee...he should be just across the board given substandard ...(Y.A.) is a little too all-powerful, they hold good men out of a crew...Forestry thinks a boy is a good worker, then Y.A. pulls him right out from under them...if they have a problem out there (on the crew) they drop it right on the supervisor... One administrator can become all-powerful when he can arbitrarily remove a boy off crew.

Camp Drake

Interstaff Problems: The inequity in salary between (Y.A.) supervisors and Forestry has an effect...the very wide range in salary differences. A Forestry foreman makes as much as our assistant superintendent...Forestry doesn't like Y.A. messing with their work program and ditto (with Y.A.) on the counselling program...the foreman wants the boys to work and the Y.A. supervisor wants to counsel him...I think he can do this during noon time. But we try to get all staff oriented to everything we do here -- so we can all go in the same direction...in our present situation (Y.A.) staff cannot counsel wards and talk with them while they're working. The other agency feels rather strongly about it interfering with the work program. (However) it depends upon the two individuals (the Y.A.) supervisor and the Forestry foreman). They work together consistently and they usually make their own arrangements...Well, it's a one-sided marriage -- we're giving and they're taking. And I'm sure there are people on the other side who feel the same way.

Camp Carson (cont.)

Ward Relationships: (Wards) do play the administrative staff against the line staff (but) I don't think they get away with this too often...the strictly forestry supervised crews will present you with more disciplinary problems... you would find more removal from camp for work refusal if you had nothing but Forestry foremen. They don't tolerate as much from these kids as we do...I believe there is pretty much of a separation of function in the thinking of the wards as to Forestry and Y.A. Y.A. represents something to them that Forestry does not...Forestry personnel do not represent the authority that the Y.A. personnel do...if there is a friendly counselling relationship worked up between a foreman and a ward this is extremely valuable...I think they (Forestry) do almost as much counselling as we do. The counselling is done on the job...Too much leniency (with wards) causes differences between Y.A. and Forestry

Camp Drake (cont.)

Ward Relationships: Boys don't want to adjust to two bosses on a job -- especially when they get conflicting instructions...we need consistency in instructions the boys get on the job... we try to get all staff oriented to everything we do here -- so we can all go in the same direction...the Forestry forman very seldom, if ever, reads the ward's file or counsel folder; they are not familiar with the case and if you get too many people counselling the same ward you'll probably get into trouble... We're trying to find an overlap in Y.A. and Forestry responsibilities.

At both camps it is clear that there are basic problems between the Y.A. and Forestry administrators concerning goals and procedures. From their responses it would appear that these center about three central issues: 1) differences in administrative goals and methods; 2) differences in the approach taken toward wards; and 3) differences in working conditions.

At both camps there was indication that the goals of Forestry and Y.A. often conflicted, but at Camp Drake there seemed to be a cooperative method in operation by which such conflicts could be ironed-out in a satisfactory manner. At Camp Carson, however, administrators admitted that communication between the two agencies over mutual problems was almost hopeless, although there was some indication of cooperative effort at the lower echelons. At Camp Carson the basic core of disagreement concerned assignment of wards to work-crews and transfers therefrom as well as work performance grading procedures. Forestry felt that Y.A. tended to transfer wards from work-crews to other assignments just as they were beginning to produce what they considered an adequate day's work, while the Y.A. felt that Forestry made unreasonable work demands of wards and tended to undergrade them for failure to live up to the standard thus established. At Camp Drake the main basis for disagreement which is mentioned concerns counseling during work hours. The Y.A. administrators felt that wards should be counseled when they needed it, regardless of the time of day, while the Forestry Superintendent felt that counseling should be confined to off-work hours.

The Camp Carson administrator's responses indicate that the Forestry staff is much less tolerant of acting-out behavior and more inclined to take punitive action than are the Y.A. staff. There is no indication of this at Camp Drake. At both camps the tendency of the Forestry staff to drop all ward problems in the lap of the Y.A. counselor is cited as a problem. The Camp Carson administrators seem generally more approving of closer relations, even counseling, between Forestry staff and wards than is the case at Camp Drake. A problem of conflicting instructions is cited at Camp Drake, but not at Camp Carson.

Differences in salary range over-time conditions are mentioned as having been a source of discontent between staffs at both camps, at one time, although this appears to have been mediated by the time of the interviews. It was generally agreed that the individual Y.A. counselors and their counterpart Forestry foremen, working together on work crews, got along reasonably well together.

Staff Questionnaire Responses

There were no items in the staff questionnaire which related to the problem of Y.A. - Forestry relation directly, but some of the differences between the responses of Forestry staff members and Y.A. staff members to other items in the questionnaire were pointed out in the two previous sections and will be apparent in succeeding sections. These differences, as will be seen, generally center around a difference in the basic objectives of the two agencies concerned: Forestry emphasizes the work program and the resource conservation function of the camps; Y.A. emphasizes the rehabilitative aspects of the camp in terms of the wards.

Ward Reactions

The Michigan questionnaire administered to the periodic samples in February and in November contained only one item exploring any difference in ward preferences toward Forestry or Y.A. staff members. The responses to this item are shown below:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses:
Y.A.-Forestry Relations

	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
Item	February (N-64)	November (N-66)	February (N-58)	November (N-80)
25. If you had a problem, something you wanted to get off your chest, who would you go to first?				
Y.A. staff member	51.6	45.6	79.3	55.0
Forestry staff member	1.6	-	-	2.5
Other responses	46.8	54.4	20.7	42.5

It appears that the wards at both camps feel that they would rather talk first with a Y.A. counselor than to a Forestry foreman, although a large number indicate that they would not take a personal problem to either a Y.A. or Forestry staff member. It also appears that Camp Drake wards are more likely to take up their problems with staff members than are Camp Carson wards.

However, a supplemental group of items administered with the Michigan questionnaire in November included four items relating to wards' feelings about staff members which appear to modify the conclusions of the above item. Responses to these items are shown below:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses: (November)
Y.A.-Forestry Staff Relations

	Item	Camp Carson (N-66)	Camp Drake (N-80)
X-2	What adult here knew you the best?		
	Y.A. staff member	48.6	42.5
	Forestry staff member	20.6	23.7
	Other responses (Nobody, other, blank)	30.8	33.8
X-3	With what staff member here did you share good news?		
	Y.A. staff member	35.2	32.5
	Forestry staff member	11.8	14.9
	Other	53.0	52.6
X-4	With what adult could you best talk about personal problems?		
	Y.A. staff member	50.0	56.3
	Forestry staff member	4.4	15.0
	Other	45.6	28.7
X-5	Who is the one who helped you the most?		
	Y.A. staff member	35.3	38.8
	Forestry staff member	17.6	25.0
	Other	47.1	36.2

It would seem from the above items that Forestry staff members do play a more important role in the life of the wards while in camp than was indicated by the previous item. The wards at Camp Drake, especially, appear more likely to retain a close relationship with a Forestry foreman than do the wards at Camp Carson.

Although administrators at both camps felt that inter-staff problems had an effect upon the wards, it is difficult to evaluate the nature of intensity of the impact. One view holds that the wards tend to differentiate between Y.A. staff members as authority figures in comparison with Forestry staff members, who are seen as "neutral". Another, that wards attempt to play upon differences between the two staffs. There is little actual evidence for either view, however. A considerable number of the wards indicate that Forestry staff are an important element in the camp milieu, but the stronger relationship seems to appear at the camp showing the least inter-staff problems.

Evaluation

Where there is either a fully integrated cooperation between the two staffs (where each supplements the work of the other) or where there is a clearly understood division of function and responsibility, (where each staff functions independently but without conflict), the problem of dual administration and its attendant affect upon ward's reaction to the camp program, would not appear too great. Where there is neither close cooperation nor clear understanding of discrete responsibility, confusion over conflicting roles is most likely to affect ward-staff relationships. The prior situation seems to characterize inter-staff relations at Camp Drake, while the latter situation seems predominant at Camp Carson.

Staff - Ward Relations

It is to be expected that differences in the relations between wards and staff members will appear relative to differences in perceived goals and treatment orientation at the two camps. Vinter and Janowitz (4; p. 313), for instance, found that in the simple-traditional type institution "dominating sanctions tended to be used to ensure obedience and compliance", and in the modern-complex type, more deviancy and disruptive behavior was permitted. They also note that wards who "are exposed to varying organizational conditions form different attitudes toward the institution and toward the staff" and that staff-ward interaction was observed to be more frequent and extensive. Grusky (2), too, found that in his "treatment-oriented" camp "the relations between staff and primary members (wards) are more likely to be cooperative, accepting and positive, than hostile, rejecting and negative".

Viewpoint of Administrators

The administrators at each camp were asked to comment upon the "sort of interpersonal relations...staff should develop with boys in camp".

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
They should establish a wholesome authority figure relationship with the kid...be firm in his handling of the ward, so the ward is under no misapprehension of who is in charge. There must be a certain authoritarian approach...Do not deal with them in an impersonal manner...it comes down to a man-to-man relationship which ceases to be impersonal...dictated by how comfortable a supervisor can feel with a given relationship...deal with them in a business-like impersonal basis...I	We're quite tolerant...talk to him at his own level...we meet the men like any employee and like them to meet us the same way...Accepting the boy as an individual. The role of simple decency plays an important part...give the ward the opportunity to relate with understanding, mature adults...the counsellor that I like to see develop is the one who employs more casework oriented techniques, rather than the old surveillance methods and making some subjective, rather than

Camp Carson (cont.)

know my place, you know your place...I don't think they should be buddy-buddy; neither should they build this wall such as the commissioned personnel and non-commissioned personnel in the military...staff should have a real concern for the boys...the Y.A. supervisors tend to be a little soft with them, but they also have to work under a tough taskmaster, especially the Forestry foreman...if we have discipline and control, we can start doing more creation... the boys don't want to get too close to you because he's got to live with the others... they get called a ________ by the boys and he'll shy away from you quick once this is hung on him.

Camp Drake (cont.)

objective observations...being friendly, treating the boys with dignity and worth...no ridiculing or belittling, no embarrassing wards. If you have to talk about embarrassing subjects, it's done in private... you establish some sort of relationship with every ward in camp, then you get a better understanding of what methods would work with him.

The administrative personnel at the two camps present quite different pictures concerning the norm of staff-ward relations. Such terms as "authority figures", "custody conscious", "authoritarian approach", "discipline and control", and "impersonal basis" are prevalent throughout at Camp Carson, while they are seldom encountered at Camp Drake, where, instead, the emphasis is upon "accepting the boy", "opportunity to relate", "casework oriented", "fair, friendly approach" and "tolerant".

Staff Questionnaire Responses

Two items on the staff questionnaire were designed to assess staff attitudes concerning: 1) relationships with wards; and 2) treatment of wards along a permissiveness - control continuum.

Staff Questionnaire Responses:
Staff-Ward Relations

	Camp Carson			Camp Drake		
Items	Total (N-11)	Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Forestry Staff (N-4)	Total (N-23)	Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Forestry Staff (N-8)
Staff attitudes on relations with wards (rated on 5-point social distance scale):						
1. Develop close relations	18.2	28.6	-	43.5	53.6	25.0
2. (Between 1. and 3.)	36.4	28.6	50.0	26.1	40.2	-
3. Be close, but not so close that authority will be questioned	36.4	42.8	25.0	17.4	6.2	37.5
4. (Between 3. and 5.)	-	-	-	4.3	-	12.5
5. Keep fairly distant	9.0	-	25.0	-	-	-
6. No answer	-	-	-	8.7	-	25.0
Staff attitudes on maintaining order (rated on 5-point social distance scale):						
1. Let wards set own limits	-	-	-	4.3	6.7	-
2. (Between 1. and 3.)	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Allow freedom...but keep close watch...	45.5	71.4	-	61.0	66.7	50.0
4. (Between 3. and 5.)	27.3	14.3	50.0	13.0	13.3	12.5
5. Maintain order at all times	9.0	-	25.0	13.0	-	37.5
6. No answer	18.2	14.3	25.0	8.7	13.3	-

It appears that the staff at Camp Drake are much more inclined to develop closer relations with wards and to be more permissive than are the staff at Camp Carson. The Camp Carson staff tend to maintain more distance between themselves and wards and to feel the need for greater surveillance and order.

Ward Reactions

A fairly large number of items in both the Michigan and the Eynon questionnaires were related to ward attitudes toward staff and evaluations of staff actions in relation to wards. The Michigan questionnaire items are presented first:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses:
Staff-Ward Relations

	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
Item	February (N-64)	November (N-66)	February (N-58)	November (N-80)
26. How well do you personally like most of the men who run this camp?				
Positive responses	29.7	31.8	74.2	68.8
Neutral responses	45.3	44.0	20.7	26.2
Negative responses	25.0	24.2	5.1	5.0
28. How many of the men who run this camp take a personal interest in the guys?				
All or most of them	18.8	19.7	58.6	56.3
About half of them	9.3	6.1	6.9	12.5
A few or none of them	71.9	69.7	32.8	30.0
No answer	-	4.5	1.7	1.2
24. How well do you feel that the men who run this camp understand your problems and needs?				
Usually understand	14.0	7.6	55.2	47.5
Sometimes understand	31.3	25.8	15.5	26.2
Don't know much about them	53.1	62.1	27.6	22.5
No answer	1.6	4.5	1.7	3.8
3f. The adults here are pretty fair.				
Agree	48.4	51.6	88.0	41.2
Disagree	34.4	30.3	3.4	38.8
Unsure or No Answer	17.2	18.1	8.6	20.0
3i. Some boys can get away with too much.				
Agree	54.7	59.1	55.2	47.5
Disagree	31.2	28.8	31.0	30.0
Unsure or No Answer	14.1	12.1	13.8	22.5

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses
Staff-Ward Relations
(cont.)

Item	Camp Carson February (N-64)	Camp Carson November (N-66)	Camp Drake February (N-58)	Camp Drake November (N-80)
3g. Adults here are not strict enough with certain boys.				
Agree	39.1	37.9	46.5	41.2
Disagree	46.9	31.8	32.8	38.8
Unsure or No Answer	14.0	30.3	20.7	20.0
3d. Some adults here are too strict.				
Agree	67.2	56.1	31.0	22.5
Disagree	23.4	25.8	56.9	55.0
Unsure or No Answer	9.4	18.1	12.1	22.5

Four items in the Eynon questionnaire were of a similar nature. It should be remembered that this questionnaire was administered only to a special sample of wards within three weeks of their arrival at camp, (pre) and just prior to their release for those going on parole (post).

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses:
Staff-Ward Relations

Item	Camp Carson Pre (N-79)	Camp Carson Post (N-60)	Camp Drake Pre (N-81)	Camp Drake Post (N-56)
1. Do you like the staff members with whom you have come in contact here?				
Most of them	44.4	40.0	64.2	64.3
Some of them	27.8	31.7	24.7	23.2
Few of them	24.0	25.0	8.6	8.9
None of them	3.8	3.3	2.5	3.6
2. Did some adult help you by taking an interest in you while you were here?				
A lot or some	41.8	61.7	62.9	67.9
Little or none	55.7	38.3	34.6	32.1
No answer	2.5	-	2.5	-

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses:
Staff-Ward Relations
(cont.)

Item	Camp Carson Pre (N-79)	Camp Carson Post (N-60)	Camp Drake Pre (N-81)	Camp Drake Post (N-56)
3. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along in here is to make friends with adults.				
Agree	44.2	46.6	51.9	51.9
Disagree	28.0	31.7	29.6	26.7
Unsure or No Answer	27.8	21.7	18.5	21.4
4. The best way to make it here is to outsmart the staff members.				
Agree	8.9	6.7	3.7	1.8
Disagree	78.4	90.0	87.7	78.5
Unsure or No Answer	12.7	3.3	8.6	19.7

Wards at the two camps have quite divergent views of staff on most of the above items from the two questionnaires. Camp Carson wards quite pointedly express less positive responses toward staff than do Camp Drake wards, they are less likely to feel that staff take a personal interest in them, or understand their problems or needs, they are less likely to see staff members as "fair" and much more inclined to feel that they are "too strict".

Evaluation

The administrators' statements, the staff questionnaire responses and the reactions of the wards upon their questionnaires all tend to agree in confirming a distinct difference in the nature of staff-ward relations between the two camps. Control, custody and aloofness characterize the relationship at Camp Carson; relative permissiveness, freedom to act-out and close interpersonal contact characterize the program at Camp Drake. As would be expected, the Camp Carson wards express a greater degree of negative attitude toward staff and staff relations than the Camp Drake wards. This tends to support the general findings of the Vinter and Janowitz study (4) and Grusky's study (2) — that ward reactions are closely related to differences in staff orientation, with more positive and friendly ward attitudes expressed at the more treatment-oriented facility.

Rules and Regulations

Given the differences between the two camps in a treatment philosophy and attitudes toward staff-ward relations, it would be expected that differences might appear in the types of internal rules and regulations promulgated for each of the camps and in the intensity with which they are enforced. It would also be expected that wards will react negatively toward the camp with the more stringent enforcement, or to see as more stringent and arbitrary the rules in that camp which they associate with a more repressive staff orientation.

Viewpoint of Administrators

The administrators at each camp were asked: 1) to what extent and under what conditions staff members should depart from strict camp rules and regulations, and 2) whether there were any rules or restrictions they would like to see changed.

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Enforcement of Regulations: Rule should be enforced by 100 percent of the staff 100 percent of the time...all staff at all times should bring it to the kid's attention that we don't do this here, (but) not use the disciplinary rule until they determine that the kid is not trying to control (their behavior)...we all feel there are too many rules and restrictions, but as long as we have mass handling of kids you are going to have to have a minimum of them...if the problem's real serious, then the rules always predominate here, but we use the manual more as a guide and not as a rulebook -- you can wander off it to cover the situation. I don't think there's ever going to be any set standard of rules when you are dealing with humans that is going to work.	Enforcement of Regulations: They should be flexible enough to meet the demand of the situation...common sense prevails. However, in day-to-day routines we try to adhere to time schedules...the rules are adequate because (the other superintendent) and are in a position to bend them and still be consistent...it is important that all staff members operate pretty much in the same method. It makes it more comfortable for the wards to know that this is our routine, this is the way we do things.
Changing Rules: If we have a rule that staff does not think should be enforced, then the thing to do is to take the rule out...there should be a real reason for it, or we shouldn't have it...when you get a bad rule, throw it out and put a new one in. We've only had our manual a year and we've already adopted changes.	Changing Rules: We try to get all staff oriented to everything we do here -- so we can all go in the same direction...if one staff member comes in and upsets the routine, it causes problems in the management of the boys ...now, we can change, but if we're going to change, everyone wants to know about the change so that we'll all change together.

Operations Manuals outlining standard rules and procedures for staff to use in their treatment of wards, how to handle specific types of incidents such as escapes, injuries, etc., and general information pertaining to their camp duties are required reading for all staff members at each camp. The Manual at Camp Carson consists of 28 pages, the one at Camp Drake of 96 pages. In general, the Manuals at each camp cover the same topics, with the latter camp spelling-out in greater detail all possible alternatives of decision in each situation. The impression is that at Camp Drake very little is left to staff judgement -- the Manual covers almost every eventuality, while at Camp Carson the Manual provides general rules which may be interpreted by staff to fit the situation at hand. It is interesting that at Camp Carson the Manual contains a section advising staff on effective methods of counseling wards and providing leadership to them, while the Camp Drake Manual makes no mention of either topic. It may be that at the latter camp it was felt that the staff did not require such a guide, or that at Camp Carson the staff especially needed it.

Staff Questionnaire Responses

Two items in the staff questionnaire were relevant to rules and regulations and their enforcement:

Staff Questionnaire Responses:
Rules and Regulations

	Camp Carson			Camp Drake		
Item	Total (N-11)	Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Forestry Staff (N-4)	Total (N-23)	Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Forestry Staff (N-8)
1. Staff should use judgement rather than follow rules in special cases:						
Agree	63.6	57.1	75.0	34.9	33.4	37.5
Disagree	36.4	42.9	25.0	47.9	46.7	50.0
Unsure or No Answer	-	-	-	17.2	19.9	12.5
2. Staff emphasis on following rules versus "having a feeling" for wards:						
Following rules more important	9.2	-	25.0	-	-	-
Better to "have a feeling" for wards	45.4	42.9	50.0	73.8	60.0	100.0
Can't do a good job without strong feeling for wards	45.4	57.1	25.0	26.2	40.0	-

The results of Item 1, above seem rather inconsistent with previous responses. It would appear that the Camp Carson staff is more lenient and less rigid in adherence to rules than the Camp Drake staff. In Item 2, although both staffs agree upon the need for "having a feeling" for wards, it would appear that the Camp Carson staff gives relatively greater emphasis to the idea of having a "strong" feeling for wards. This suggests that the Camp Carson staff members are somewhat more apt to trust their own subjective evaluations of boys than are the more "professionally" oriented staff members at Camp Drake. Thus, Camp Carson staff would see less need for any objective criteria for judging "right" from "wrong" behavior and would also tend to resent any hampering restrictions upon their own personal views of how to handle a particular situation.

Vinter and Lind (5, p. 34) noted in their study, for instance, that "operating staff perceived the school's formal rule system as inadequate and restrictive; large proportions of workers substituted their own ways of handling the boys, with a strong tendency toward repressive and tighter controls." Although there is no way of adequately accessing the validity of this explanation from the available data, it would seem to be in accord with the general orientation of the Camp Carson staff.

Ward Reactions

Three items in the Michigan questionnaire and four items in the Eynon questionnaire relate to rules and their observance. The Michigan items are presented first:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses: Rules and Regulations

Item	Camp Carson February (N-64)	Camp Carson November (N-66)	Camp Drake February (N-58)	Camp Drake November (N-80)
4. Have you ever broken a rule here?				
Yes	71.9	80.3	60.3	45.0
No	28.1	15.2	38.0	52.5
No Answer	-	4.5	1.7	2.5
3b. We are not allowed to smoke enough.				
Agree	28.1	9.1	38.0	6.2
Disagree	71.9	80.3	60.3	90.0
Unsure or No Answer	-	10.6	1.7	3.8
3e. Boys should be able to suggest changes in work programs, smoking rules and activities.				
Agree	73.4	75.8	67.2	60.0
Disagree	18.8	13.6	20.7	27.5
Unsure or No Answer	7.8	10.6	12.1	12.5

The Pre and Post responses on the Eynon questionnaire are shown below:

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses: Rule and Regulations

Item	Camp Carson Pre (N-79)	Camp Carson Post (N-60)	Camp Drake Pre (N-81)	Camp Drake Post (N-56)
1. Have you ever broken rules here?				
Two, one or none	59.5	36.7	85.2	48.2
More than two	40.5	63.3	14.8	51.8
2. This seems to be a place where a guy waits around for others to tell him what to do.				
Agree	16.4	16.7	16.0	10.7
Disagree	69.6	65.0	74.1	73.2
Unsure or No Answer	14.0	18.3	9.9	16.1

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses:
Rule and Regulations
(cont.)

Item	Camp Carson Pre (N-79)	Camp Carson Post (N-60)	Camp Drake Pre (N-81)	Camp Drake Post (N-56)
3. This seems to be a place where a guy must obey a lot of phony rules.				
Agree	19.0	25.0	8.6	7.2
Disagree	64.6	50.0	81.5	75.0
Unsure or No Answer	16.4	25.0	9.9	17.8
4. If you were the superintendent here would you make any changes in the way this place is run?				
One or two, or none	25.3	18.3	49.4	50.0
Quite a few	74.7	80.0	50.6	46.4
No Answer	-	1.7	-	3.6

Evaluation

In looking at ward reactions to rules, clear and distinct differences between the two camps appear which coincide with the direction of their previous responses to other items. In general, the Camp Drake wards appear more satisfied with the regulations at their camp than do the wards at Camp Carson. The latter are much more prone to feel that they live under a "lot of phony rules", and to express a desire to "change the way the place is run".

From the interviews with administrators and the staff questionnaire it would appear that there is some difference between the two camps concerning the stringency with which rules and regulations are to be enforced. The comparison is not clear, however, since the interviews at Camp Drake failed to elicit much comment concerned with the subject. Too, the staff questionnaire responses from Camp Carson appear subject to re-interpretation in view of their answers to previous items.

It seems possible that the ward reaction at Camp Carson is a result, not so much of the strictness of the rules, but of the manner in which the rules are enforced. Thus, the Camp Carson staff indicated a tendency to deal with problems on a person-to-person basis more than did the Camp Drake staff, but at the same time the Camp Carson administrators indicated a problem of consistent application of rules by all staff members. If it is true that the various staff members at Camp Carson enforce rules differently with different wards, then the greater ward dissatisfaction with such enforcement, which likely appears to the wards as arbitrary and inconsistent, thus inequitable and unfair, becomes quite understandable.

Counseling and Treatment

In a previous section, administrator and staff attitudes, and ward reactions, related to general goal orientation at the two camps, were presented. Opposing tendencies were found between the two camps along the treatment continuum characterized by permissive counseling-orientations on the one hand, and by controlled guidance-training orientations on the other. The present section is devoted to an examination of the ways in which these orientations are expressed in the day-to-day operations of the camps.

Viewpoints of Administrators

Pertinent questions asked of the administrators refer to frequency and nature of staff-ward counseling, how particular incidents are handled, and the administration of rewards and punishments.

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Counseling: A lot of the counseling we do here is not just in rehabilitation as such, such as treatment, it is also vocational counseling....(it) is a continuous thing...a word here, a word there with a ward. There are some wards who will approach me with their problems and there are some who won't -- and they will approach someone else. We have enough variety in the types of staff that every ward can find one of the staff that he can chat with if he's got something to talk about...I think we go overboard on counseling. There's a time and place for it, but it should not interfere with the normal day's work program. The boys get so they view this as a rest and over do it... (Y.A.) should be there if the boys have a problem, but they shouldn't live a boy's life for him -- the boy's an individual...There's a definite place for counseling by Forestry. I've seen many boys come out real well with no Y.A. supervisors. Forestry talks to the boys if the kid really has a problem. Forestry is ready to talk with them at any time, but not to extremes.	**Counseling**: What is counseling? To me it's nothing more than the relationship that one person has with another. And it's not necessarily the verbiage, but it's the feeling that one person has for another. I think there is "counseling" that transpires. Sometimes, pretty direct structuring could be classified as counseling...There's no counseling by the Forestry staff (although) the Forestry man will talk with the boys a lot. Y.A. tries to get inside him. I think they should sit around and discuss, but don't pry too much -- don't get too personal. You've got to treat different boys differently, however, the objectives should be the same. It arouses resentment if one person receives too much attention or if a supervisor seems to be too close to one boy.
Handling Incidents: We are not equipped to handle very many non-conformists -- the real acting-out aggressor non-conformists...(in case of fighting) set the people down and let them talk it out... but it should not be condoned or permitted...if you have too much acting out the other kids will resent it...Protecting the program is important. You have to get (the acting-out ward) out at the point where you determine that you can't gamble with the entire group...the secret of this business is to keep them busy. The more new things you show them the better off they are. Keep them busy. Whether they like it or not, in the end it is best.	**Handling Incidents**: The Forestry man will talk with a boy several times for messing-up before taking it up with the Y.A. man...you have to allow a certain amount of acting out.

Staff Questionnaire Responses

Two items in the staff questionnaire sought responses to fairly specific types of ward treatment in particular situations. Another item was concerned with rewards for good behavior. Staff responses to these items are shown below:

Staff Questionnaire Responses: Counseling and Treatment

Item	Camp Carson			Camp Drake		
	Total (N-11)	Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Forestry Staff (N-4)	Total (N-23)	Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Forestry Staff (N-8)
1. Staff reactions to impertinent ward:						
Counsel him	36.4	42.9	25.0	60.9	66.6	50.0
Warn him of possible bad write-up	9.1	14.3	-	-	-	-
Give him a bad write-up	54.5	42.8	75.0	21.8	20.0	25.0
Other or No Answer	-	-	-	17.3	13.4	25.0
2. Disposition of potential escapee from camp:						
Counsel and give him another chance	36.3	57.2	-	86.9	86.7	87.5
Counsel, but have everyone watch him closely	18.2	14.3	25.0	8.8	13.3	-
Recommend his transfer to an institution	45.5	28.5	75.0	4.3	-	12.5
3. Staff members need more ways of rewarding and praising wards for good behavior.						
Agree	54.5	57.1	50.0	82.6	86.7	75.0
Disagree	27.3	14.3	50.0	8.7	-	25.0
Unsure or No Answer	18.2	28.6	-	8.7	13.3	-

There is a clear tendency for the Camp Drake Youth Authority staff to show more leniency and greater permissiveness in response to behavioral lapses than is the case at Camp Carson. It is rather interesting that these orientations extend also to the two Forestry staffs. This would seem to coincide to some extent with the administrators' comments, although the interview data from Camp Drake is somewhat scanty.

Ward Reactions

Only two items on the Michigan questionnaire appeared relevant to the topic, but six of the items in the Eynon questionnaire had direct bearing upon counseling and treatment. The Michigan responses are presented below:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses:
Counseling and Treatment

Item	Camp Carson February (N-64)	Camp Carson November (N-66)	Camp Drake February (N-58)	Camp Drake November (N-80)
5. How many times in the last two weeks have you talked with your counselor for at least a few minutes?				
None or one	76.6	54.6	39.7	37.4
Two or more	20.3	39.3	58.6	56.4
No answer	3.1	6.1	1.7	6.2
6. When you talk with your counselor, which one of these things do you talk about the most?				
Parole or Release Date	18.8	28.8	22.4	15.0
Why I got into trouble in the past	4.7	3.0	10.3	1.2
In-camp problems	12.5	9.1	29.3	2.4
Future plans	3.1	3.0	5.2	19.0
Personal problems	1.6	6.1	3.4	12.5
Other	3.1	1.5	10.4	2.4
No answer	56.2	48.5	19.0	47.5

The differences in ward reactions between the two camps in response to Item 5 are apparent. The responses to Item 6 are, on the other hand, more confusing. There is some indication that wards who indicated "None" on Item 5 generally did not answer Item 6. Where Item 6 was answered, it appears that Camp Drake wards were somewhat more concerned with "behavior problems" topics than were the Camp Carson wards, who tended to be more concerned with topics concerning immediate benefits such as parole dates, home visits, work crew assignments, etc.

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses:
Counseling and Treatment

Item	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	Pre (N-79)	Post (N-60)	Pre (N-81)	Post (N-56)
1. The best way to get along here is to talk about yourself to some adult.				
Agree	32.9	30.0	35.8	34.0
Disagree	31.7	33.4	42.0	35.6
Undecided	35.4	36.6	22.2	30.4
2. While he's here, the average guy finds out why he got into trouble.				
Agree	63.3	66.7	53.1	55.3
Disagree	17.7	13.3	28.4	12.5
Undecided or No answer	19.0	20.0	18.5	32.2
3. Did the staff members here really try to help you?				
Most of the time	36.7	28.3	55.6	53.6
Some of the time	40.5	41.7	33.3	35.7
Little or None of the time	19.0	30.0	11.1	10.7
No Answer	3.8	-	-	-
4. This seems to be a place where a guy will never get a break.				
Agree	10.1	6.6	8.6	5.4
Disagree	72.2	78.4	81.5	80.3
Unsure or No Answer	17.7	15.0	9.9	14.3
5. Were you ever sent to lock-up or given a bad write-up here?				
Three or more times	-	6.7	-	3.6
Once or twice	8.9	26.7	6.2	41.1
Never or No Answer	91.1	66.6	93.8	55.3

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses:
Counseling and Treatment
(cont.)

Item	Camp Carson Pre (N-79)	Camp Carson Post (N-60)	Camp Drake Pre (N-81)	Camp Drake Post (N-56)
6. The program here is:				
Good	46.8	48.3	67.9	69.6
50/50	39.2	31.7	22.2	26.8
Poor	14.0	18.3	9.9	3.6
No Answer	-	1.7	-	-

In relation to the items concerning the staff members (Item 3) and to the evaluation of the program (Item 6), Camp Drake wards clearly responded with more favorable reactions than did Camp Carson wards. Camp Drake wards also seemed to feel more positive toward their treatment by staff than did Camp Carson wards (Item 4), although they indicated they had received more punitive action by staff than did the wards at Camp Carson (Item 5). Camp Carson wards, on the other hand, were less likely to take a negative attitude toward talking with staff members (Item 1) and more likely to agree that the "average guy finds out why he got into trouble" as a result of his camp experience (Item 2).

Evaluation

The Vinter and Janowitz finding that in custodial-oriented institutions dominating sanctions are used to ensure obedience and compliance from wards, while in more treatment-oriented institutions more deviancy or disruptive behavior was permitted, has already been noted. They explain that this is due to the requirement that a focus on personality change, as implied by the treatment orientation, "somehow penetrate the facade of compliance (4; p. 313)." Although Camp Carson is not strictly a "custodial" facility, its general staff orientation appears much closer to the simple-traditional model than does Camp Drake. At Camp Carson, the Vinter-Janowitz finding appears somewhat confirmed. Thus administrators at Camp Carson appear concerned about "too much acting-out" and emphasize "protecting the program." "Keep them busy" is seen as the best way to maintain order. Vocational counseling and hard work are seen as important parts of the program. From the staff questionnaire responses it is clear that the Camp Drake staff are much more likely to want to react permissively toward acting-out behavior.

As would be expected, in reaction to a treatment-oriented staff, the wards at Camp Drake indicated much more counseling contact with staff members than did the Camp Carson wards. They also indicated more favorable attitudes toward staff and the program generally. Camp Carson wards, however, reported receiving less punitive actions from staff than did Camp Drake wards. The latter would seem to imply that possibly the Camp Carson wards, although receiving less punishment generally, felt that it was worse, or less just, than did the Camp Drake wards in relation to the punishment which they received.

It would seem from the administrators' statements, the staff questionnaires and the ward's responses that the treatment accorded wards by staff at the two camps does differ considerably in the directions indicated by their differing perceptions of camp goals and treatment orientations.

Therapeutic Benefits of the Camp Programs

The staff at both camps are quite clear in their feelings that they are doing something purposeful and positive for the wards, and despite differences in goals, treatment attitudes and operating procedures, staff members and administrators at each camp generally feel that whatever they are doing is what is best for the ward.

Viewpoints of Administrators

In order to explore the dynamics of ward-staff interaction, administrators were asked: "What are the principal ways in which boys tend to benefit... from their experiences in this camp?" and "What kinds of boys are most likely and least likely to benefit?" Vinter and Janowitz suggest, for instance, that wards in treatment institutions where the environment is supportive, consistent and nurturing tend to develop a more positive self-image, leading to more positive acceptance of socially approved norms and values. (4, p. 504) Other aspects of the overall programs at the camps might also affect a wards adjustment while at camp and to his post-release rehabilitation.

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Kinds of Benefits: If we can get a kid in here who couldn't hold a job to save his soul, and turn him loose being well qualified and able to hold a stoop labor job, or any other kind of job, then we've really accomplished something...We always hope they take something out of here that's of benefit to them -- like good work habits, trying to get along, and their ways of life in the past is changed...I think this is important: bringing them out of their shell and their acceptance of	Kinds of Benefits: They have the feeling that they are recognized, they're not just some number in camp...they have an opportunity to express their views and their needs, helps them out...work experience...

Camp Carson (cont.)	Camp Drake (cont.)
work. They realize it's easier to do your work than get out of it...they've learned there's an honest way to make a living.	
Kinds of Boys: Kids from rural areas make the kind of adjustment that we like to see...The kid we help the most is the one who doesn't know a darn thing about work...relatively unsophisticated kid is the one who is likely to be benefitted the most... usually these little Okie farm boys from down the farm belt do real well and your Mexicans...Kids who came from a family that taught them responsibility, kids who have worked, especially in farming and in the woods. Husky, physically able people. The young, immature boy that never worked before, and your braggart, he has trouble in camp...institutionalized kid will be less likely to be benefitted ...the little fellow who is bounced around, been in trouble a lot, or boys having poor family ties and no work experience...the kid who is so lazy that he is not going to work, and refuses...the kid that is so resentful that he can't accept it -- he hates it here.	Kinds of Boys: If staff can tolerate this aggressive, know-it-all kid, this is the boy that really gets something from this program...the boys who have the ability to go on -- and he realizes in a hurry: maybe I'm better off using what ability I have...the wards that can be helped the most by our program are the ones that are more apt to be removed. This passive kid that's been in and out of institutions, we don't reach him at all...the conformists, the guy that does everything that you expect of him...invariably this is the guy that gets back into trouble. He's the one who has troubles on parole.

The Camp Carson administrators tended to emphasize the work-training aspects of the program, which is consistent with their orientation as seen previously, as the major affective element in their program. They tend to view the ward who lacks work experience as most likely to benefit from the program, but at the same time see him as the ward most likely to fail in camp. Camp Drake administrators, on the other hand, see the "aggressive, know-it-all" and the "acting-out" wards as the most likely to benefit. Work experience is also emphasized at Camp Drake, not so much as a job training regime, but rather as a method of developing initiative and self-reliance, confidence, etc.

Staff Questionnaire Responses

There were no items upon the staff questionnaire directly relevant to this topic and, therefore, no estimate of staff agreement with administrators' statements can be made.

Ward Reactions

Two items on the Michigan questionnaire and four items on the Eynon questionnaire were relevant to the topic, as shown below:

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses: Therapeutic Benefits

Item	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	February (N-64)	November (N-66)	February (N-58)	November (N-80)
11. Have you been helped here to prepare for future employment you would like to have?				
Helped	37.5	33.3	62.1	47.5
Little or No Help	62.5	59.1	36.2	47.5
No Answer	-	7.6	1.7	5.0
16. Did you get a chance here to learn any type of work you were really interested in?				
Yes	23.4	21.2	51.7	52.4
No	76.6	75.8	46.6	43.8
No Answer	-	3.0	1.7	3.8

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses: Therapeutic Benefits

Item	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	Pre (N-79)	Post (N-60)	Pre (N-81)	Post (N-56)
1. Did watching your step help you while you were here?				
Some or a lot	75.9	90.0	86.4	87.5
Little or None	24.1	10.0	13.6	12.5
2. While he is here, the average guy learns how to get along better with other people.				
Agree	77.2	83.3	77.0	80.3
Disagree	12.7	6.7	7.4	1.8
Unsure or No Answer	10.1	10.0	15.6	17.9
3. The average guy gets a chance to improve himself up here.				
Agree	84.8	81.6	77.8	78.5
Disagree	7.6	6.7	7.4	-
No Answer	7.6	11.7	14.8	21.5
4. If I keep out of trouble on the outside, it will be because of what I learned here.				
Agree	46.8	58.3	45.6	48.2
Disagree	40.5	21.7	37.1	21.4
No Answer	12.7	20.0	17.3	30.4

The Eynon items, mainly concerned with personality and self-development concepts, failed to show any great differences between the two camps. The Michigan questionnaire items, however, reveal considerable differences in ward reaction between the two camps. Most noticeably, Camp Carson wards tended to discount the value of the work program, while Camp Drake wards tended to state that it was of interest and help to them.

Evaluation:

The most apparent implication of the above analyses is that at Camp Carson, where work training tends to be emphasized, by staff, the wards tend to discount its value to themselves, while at Camp Drake, where the staff give relatively less emphasis to the work program, the wards tend to perceive it as being of considerable value and help. It seems likely that at Camp Carson the wards are reacting against the staff emphasis, while at Camp Drake they are responding to an integral aspect of the overall program.

Assessment of Ward Progress

The primary purpose of any institutional treatment is to prepare the ward for parole -- for his return to the community with, what is hoped, a lessened tendency to indulge in delinquent acts in the future. In theory, a ward is released from a camp when the Youth Authority Board feels that there is some assurance, based upon staff evaluations and recommendations, that the ward can safely be paroled. In practice, of course, various other pressures, such as the need for space, exert considerable influence upon the Board's decisions.

Viewpoints of Administrators

The camp administrators were asked what factors were most important in evaluating a ward's rehabilitative adjustment, how effective their evaluation procedures were and what its effects might be.

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Factors: Forestry will tend to think in terms almost exclusively of just how much work we can get done...Youth Authority more in terms of training, but...if we get good training -- if we teach good work habits, then production naturally is going to follow...the staff tries to evaluate the kid's attitudes more than anything else...of course the only type of	Factors: How he gets along with his peers, what kind of work record does he have, how he got along with staff...how he is doing in the barracks...incidence reports for any unusual behavior...The whole situation is discussed from what the boy has talked about...Depending upon the individual there are other areas we hit on...Times we concern

Camp Carson (cont.)	Camp Drake (cont.)
thing we have to go on is the kid's performance and how he has done...There is probably not enough accent placed on -- how's he going to do on parole? But hopefully they are thinking more in terms of changes in attitude toward the total program...(We) try to look for underlying traits and traces...don't compare the institutionalized ward with the ward who is really trying...observation of his adjustment to work program, how he works, his attitude toward the work...adjustment in the camp setting, how he fits into the barracks routine, into the recreational program, how he gets along with his peer group, whether he's a loner or whether he is outgoing and fits in with anybody and everybody... whether he's trying to pull his share of the load.	ourselves if he is race conscious, various things like that...how he gets along in general, does he keep his nose clean, does he mind his own business, this sort of thing...Common sense...
Effectiveness: We have a grade system which has its good and bad points...it forces staff to tell the kid how he thinks they are doing. The problem in the grade system is that there are 17 different people...We have the monthly case conference, trying to get everybody's opinion...I don't think staff very clearly evaluated the difference between what is basic to the kid's character and personality and what is there simply because he was institutionalized...There is almost no correlation between how a boy does in camp and how he will do on the street.	Effectiveness: The staff has now developed to a point where now we are able to recognize individual differences -- some of the boys don't have the capacity for work output that others do, and some of the boys aren't quite as sharp as others, they're taking these things into consideration...as far as his response to counseling, his reaction to the counseling situation, this sort of thing, we very seldom discuss it...We've had a lot of supervisory experience judging men and we judge them the same as any other employee...
Effect on Wards: I think the above standard grade doesn't tend to damage the kid in his approach to adjustment, I think that a sub-standard grade can cause this kid to lose his drive to adjust to the program. He throws up his hands and says, "What's the use?"	Effect on Wards: When he's not making any more progress -- he's levelled off and we've done about as much as we can do for him, then he's ready for parole.

The impression to be derived from the administrators' comments is that at Camp Carson particular performance criteria form the primary basis for judgment: "adjustment to the work program", "how he fits into the barrack's routine", "the grade system", etc. while at Camp Drake the administrators appear somewhat more concerned with generalized and behavioral factors such as: "if he is race conscious", "how he gets along in general... does he mind his own business", "unusual behavior", etc. Otherwise there does not appear to be too extreme a difference between the two camps. Both administrator groups are aware of certain common problems in evaluation, such as differentiating the ward who is "really trying" from the institutionalized ward, balancing the tendency of Forestry to rate almost exclusively in terms of work achievement, etc.

Staff Questionnaire Responses

Two questions were asked in the staff questionnaire relevant to evaluations of ward achievement and the effectiveness of treatment, the first concerning positive anticipations, the second concerning negative anticipations. Vinter and Janowitz (4; p. 313) found that patterns of staff-ward relations appear to affect the degree of pessimism or optimism regarding positive ward changes under treatment. If this is correct, it would be expected that the Camp Carson staff, as more oriented toward the simple-traditional pattern, would tend toward greater pessimism. This expectation was confirmed and the results are shown below:

Staff Questionnaire Responses: Assessment of Ward Progress

	Camp Carson			Camp Drake		
Item	Total (N-11)	Y.A. Staff (N-7)	Forestry Staff (N-4)	Total (N-23)	Y.A. Staff (N-15)	Forestry Staff (N-8)
1. Expectations of positive change among wards during camp-stay.						
Most will improve	54.5	57.2	50.0	74.0	80.0	62.5
About half will improve	18.2	28.5	-	13.0	6.7	25.0
Few will improve	27.3	14.3	50.0	13.0	13.3	12.5
2. Expectations of negative change among wards during camp-stay.						
None will worsen	18.2	28.6	-	30.4	33.3	25.0
Few will worsen	36.4	42.8	25.0	43.5	40.0	50.0
Some will worsen	45.4	28.6	75.0	26.1	26.7	25.0

On both items, the difference between the two camp staffs on a pessimism-optimism continuum is apparent and appears to accord with the hypothesis cited above.

Ward Reactions

Vinter and Janowitz also found that ward attitudes toward change and treatment were more positive for wards in modern-complex institutions than for those in simple-traditional institutions (4; p. 477). Two items in the Michigan questionnaire were relevant to the topic, and three items in the Eynon questionnaire.

Ward's Michigan Questionnaire Responses: Assessment of Ward Progress

		Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	Item	February (N-64)	November (N-66)	February (N-58)	November (N-80)
14a	How much would you say your stay here has helped you?				
	Great deal or quite a bit	57.8	68.2	75.9	83.7
	Not much, very little	35.9	21.2	15.5	8.7
	None, No Answer	6.3	10.6	8.6	7.6
2.	What do you think your chances of staying out of trouble with the law will be after you leave here?				
	Good	78.1	69.1	89.7	82.6
	About 50/50	20.3	19.1	8.6	13.7
	Not too good	1.6	4.4	1.7	2.5
	No Answer	-	7.4	-	1.2

Ward's Eynon Questionnaire Responses Assessment of Ward Progress

		Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	Item	Pre (N-64)	Post (N-66)	Pre (N-58)	Post (N-79)
1.	It really helps a guy to be up here.				
	Agree	51.9	56.6	54.3	66.1
	Disagree	21.5	16.7	21.0	10.7
	Unsure or No Answer	26.6	26.7	24.7	23.2
2.	My stay here has helped me.				
	Agree	68.3	78.3	60.6	83.9
	Disagree	15.2	6.7	12.3	5.4
	Unsure or No Answer	16.5	15.0	27.1	10.7
3.	I think that I am a better guy because I have been here.				
	Agree	30.4	41.7	24.6	48.2
	Disagree	51.9	28.3	42.0	33.9
	Unsure or No Answer	17.7	30.0	33.4	17.9

On both the Michigan questionnaire items the more positive response of the Camp Drake wards is apparent. On the three Eynon items the major difference is to be seen in the degree of positive change from Pre- to Post-test responses for wards from each camp. On all three items the greater change in a positive direction was found at Camp Drake.

Evaluation

Administrators' statements, staff questionnaire responses and the reactions of wards all complement each other in portraying a distinct difference beetween the two camps in terms of the manner, criteria and effects of ward assessment. The directions of the statements and responses for this topic for each of the camps is in accord with the differences previously noted for the other topical categories; i.e., Camp Carson wards were less optomistic concerning the help they received from the program and of their chances of staying out of trouble on parole than were the wards from Camp Drake, while the major Pre- to Post-test change in Eynon items were from the Camp Drake wards.

Overview

The foregoing analyses of administrators' statements, staff questionnaire responses and/or ward reactions on eight topical categories concerned with overt elements in the camp milieux related to staff goal orientations, treatment practices and interpersonal relationships have tended to emphasize distinctive differences between the two study camps. A comparative summary profile of these differences on various points is shown below:

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Goal Orientation	
Teaching-training emphasis	Therapeutic treatment emphasis
Controlled guidance techniques	Permissive techniques

Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Staff Characteristics	
Ability to dominate and control	Ability to reason with and outthink
Tends to be younger	Tends to be older
Less well educated	Better educated
More satisfied with job opportunity	Less satisfied with job opportunity
Less satisfied with camp program	More satisfied with camp program
Less open to innovation	Willingness to experiment
Youth Authority - Forestry Relations	
Conflicting at upper echelons	Cooperative at all levels
Staff - Ward Relations	
Custody oriented	Casework oriented
Discipline stressed	Tolerance of acting-out
Relative aloofness	Relative close interrelationship
Less positive ward response	More positive ward response
Rules and Regulations	
Staff favors individual interpretation	Staff tends toward legalistic interpretation
Less positive ward response	More positive ward response
Counseling and Treatment	
Discipline and control emphasized	Lenient-Permissive climate emphasized
Wards report less staff contact	Wards report more staff contact
Affective Elements of Camp Program	
Staff emphasizes work program	Staff emphasizes treatment aspects
Wards see work training as less beneficial and helpful	Wards see work training as beneficial and helpful
Evaluation of Ward Progress	
Staff emphasizes work performance	Staff emphasizes attitude change
Ward self-evaluation and expectations less positive	Ward self-evaluation and expectations more positive

The emphasis which has been placed upon these differences, of course, should not overlook the large number of similarities between each camp milieu, especially when they are compared to other facilities, or even to other camps. The importance of the noted differences lies in their relation to what may be termed the intentional "formal treatment elements" in each camp. That is, they are relevant to the ways in which the administrators and staffs at each camp feel that they are contributing to the rehabilitation of the wards under their charge, through certain techniques of interaction and through the creation of a particular "climate" within which rehabilitation can best be effectuated. In terms of these, then, it seems clear that the wards at Camp Carson face a distinctly different set of formal treatment elements in their milieu than do the wards at Camp Drake. Their differential responses to questionnaire items relevant to these formal treatment elements strongly support the differences seen in the staff responses and the statements of the camp administrators.

An interesting feature which appears when the wards' responses to items from the Eynon questionnaire are reviewed suggests that general attitudes toward the camp programs are internalized at a relatively early time in the ward's camp experience and remain relatively stable throughout his stay there. Thus, the Eynon items are generally of two types: 1) items concerned with actual camp experiences ("Have you ever broken a rule here?", "Did the staff members here really try to help you?", etc.) and 2) items concerned with attitudes toward the camp program and staff ("The best way to make it here is to be slick.", "The best way to get along here is to talk about yourself to some adult.", etc.). Noticeably, pre- post change in response is much greater for the first type of item than for the second. For a number of the latter type items the pre- post change is minimal, suggesting that the attitude or opinion expressed was developed by the wards shortly after arriving at the camp and maintained fairly consistently during their camp stay. On most of such items, moreover, there are fairly strong indications of a difference between the two camps in terms of the attitude expressed. For some of the items which are similar to items on the Michigan questionnaire, it appears that the attitudes expressed have continuity within each camp over time. The implication seems to be, therefore, that particular attitude orientations have become traditional in each camp. Probably through peer group interaction the newly arrived ward discovers what the "official" peer group attitude should be and maintains it during his stay, passing it on in turn to successive waves of new arrivals. Attempts to further assess this hypothesis will be made in Phases III and IV of this study.

GENERAL WARD ATTITUDES TOWARD CAMP AND SELF EXPECTATIONS

Two sets of items from the Michigan questionnaire (several of which have already been examined) are directly concerned with 1) attitudes toward the camp, camp staff and camp program, and 2) estimations of the effect and consequences of the camp experience upon the wards themselves. From the responses of the wards to items in each of these sets two composite variables (scales) were formed which could be more readily correlated with such other variables as ward characteristics, staff ratings, recidivism, etc.

Attitude Toward Camp Scale

Michigan questionnaire items which were used to construct this scale are:

9. What do you think about this place now? Is it better than you expected or worse than you expected?

10. If you had your choice to come to this camp, or go to an institution...which would you choose?

19. Think about yourself now - what do _you_ think about this place?

23. Considering everything, how do you like it here in camp?

27. In general, do you think of yourself as having gotten a square deal here at camp?

Ward responses to each of the above items were transformed into numerical scores, thus:

Responses unfavorable to the camp = 1
Uncertain, or No answer = 2
Responses favorable to the camp = 3

For each ward the numbered scores for each of the five items were totalled, providing a possible scale ranging from five (all responses unfavorable) to 15 (all responses favorable). This range was then trichotomized and labelled as follows:

Total Scores	Category
12 thru 15	Positive attitude
9 thru 11	Neutral attitude
5 thru 8	Negative attitude

It should be noted that random responding would provide total scores within the Positive or Negative attitude categories 28.5 percent of the time respectively, and in the Neutral category 43 percent of the time.

Differences in Ward Reactions to Camp. The scores upon the Attitude toward Camp scale were compared between the Camp Carson and Camp Drake periodic samples for February and November, as shown in Table 3:

Table 3

General Ward Attitudes Toward Camp, Camp Drake and Camp Carson, February and November Samples (by Percentage)

	February Samples			November Samples		
Category	Camp Carson (N-64)	Camp Drake (N-58)	Total (N-122)	Camp Carson (N-66)	Camp Drake (N-79)	Total (N-145)
Positive:	31.3	86.2	57.3	48.5	77.2	64.2
Neutral:	25.0	13.8	19.7	28.8	19.0	23.4
Negative:	43.7	--	23.0	22.7	3.8	12.4
Significance:	$\chi^2 = 43.334$ (2 d.f.) $P < .001$			$\chi^2 = 16.481$ (2 d.f.) $P < .001$		

As would be expected from the previous analyses, expressed attitudes toward their respective camps vary sharply between the two camp populations at each sample period. The data suggest, however, a lack of consistency between the responses of wards at Camp Carson between the two sample periods, which is confirmed by Chi-square (P less than .05). Thus, Camp Carson wards tended to express more favorable attitudes toward the camp in November than in February. There was no significant difference in responses of the wards at Camp Drake between the two sample periods. On the hypothesis that the difference observed for Camp Carson might be a function of the length of time a ward had spent in camp at the time the questionnaires were administered, the proportions of wards who had been in camp 89 days or less, and 90 days or more, were compared between the two samples for each camp. No significant differences were encountered for either camp.

Nor were any significant differences encountered when the two camps were compared by length of stay for each of the two sample periods.

In order to determine the independence of the Attitudes toward Camp scale, comparisons were made within each camp sample with known personal characteristics. No significant relationships were found between the scale categories and the variables: court of commitment, region of commitment, base expectancy score or age. Significant Chi-square values were found in relation to admission status for the November sample at Camp Drake (P = less than .05), and in relation to Offense category for the February sample at Camp Carson (P = less than .01). Since there was no consistent tendency shown, however, nor is any hypothesis suggested to account for the relationships, they can most likely be attributed to chance sampling variation. The relationship of the scale scores with the only other characteristics variable to be tested: Ethnic Background deserves more detailed consideration, as shown in Table 4: (next page)

Table 4

Attitude Toward Camp and Ethnic Background
Camp Carson and Camp Drake Wards,
February and November, 1963

Camp Scale Score Category	February Sample				November Sample			
	Cauc.	Negro	Mex. Am./ Other	Total	Cauc.	Negro	Mex. Am./ Other	Total
Camp Carson (N)	(25)	(25)	(14)	(64)	(32)	(20)	(14)	(66)
Positive	56.0	00.0	42.8	31.3	65.6	30.0	35.7	48.5
Neg./Neut.[a]	44.0	100.0	57.2	68.7	34.4	70.0	64.3	51.5
	$^{o}\chi^2$ = 2 d.f., p = < .001				χ^2 = 2 d.f., p = < .05			
Camp Drake (N)	(32)	(20)	(6)	(58)	(44)	(22)	(13)	(79)
Positive	90.6	75.0	100.0	86.2	88.6	63.6	61.5	77.2
Neg./Neut.	9.4	25.0	00.0	13.8	11.4	36.4	38.5	22.8
	χ^2 = 2 d.f., p = n.s.				χ^2 = 2 d.f., p = < .02			

[a] Since the Camp Drake choices were nearly all Positive, and the numbers for the other categories were so small, it was necessary to combine the Neutral and Negative categories for comparison.

There is an obvious difference between the responses of each of the different ethnic groups between the two camps, largely as a result of the overwhelming positive response of the Camp Drake wards regardless of race. Within each camp sample, however, strong differences appear in the response patterns between ethnic groups. Thus Negroes in each camp sample respond more negatively than do Caucasians. The chi-square values for each camp sample emphasize the differences in response between ethnic groups, (the lack of significance for the February sample at Camp Drake being attributable to the extremely small frequencies of responses in the Negative/ Neutral category).

Perception of Program Value Scale

Michigan questionnaire items which were used to construct this scale are:

11. Have you been helped here to prepare for future employment you would like to have?

14. How much would you say that your stay here has helped you?

16. Did you get a chance here to learn any type of work you were really interested in?

22. What do you think your chances of staying out of trouble with the law will be after you leave here?

As in the Attitude Toward Camp scale, ward responses to each of the above items were transformed into numerical scores, thus:

Responses unfavorable to the program effect = 1

Uncertain, or No Answer = 2

Responses favorable to the program effect = 3

For each ward the numbered scores for each of the four items were totalled, providing a possible scale ranging from 4 to 12 points. This range was then trichotomized and labelled as follows:

Total Scores	Category
10 thru 12	Optimistic
7 thru 9	Neutral
4 thru 6	Pessimistic

Random responding would provide total scores within the Optimistic and Pessimistic categories 26.7 percent of the time respectively, and in the Neutral category 46.6 percent of the time.

Differences in Ward Perceptions of Program Value. The scores on the Perception of Program Value scale were compared for each ward with his score on the Attitude Toward Camp Scale, as shown in Table 5:

Table 5

Perceptions of Program Value vs. Attitude Toward Camp,
Camp Carson and Camp Drake Wards,
February and November Samples

Attitude Toward Camp Scale Score Category	Perceptions of Program Value							
	February Sample				November Sample			
	Optim.	Neutr.	Pess.	Total	Optim.	Neutr.	Pess.	Total
Camp Carson (N)	(N-22)	(N-23)	(N-19)	(N-64)	(N-20)	(N-32)	(N-14)	(N-66)
Positive	54.5	30.4	5.3	31.3	60.0	46.8	35.7	48.5
Neutral	27.3	34.8	10.5	25.0	20.0	34.4	28.6	28.8
Negative	18.2	34.8	84.2	43.7	20.0	18.8	35.7	22.7
	χ^2 = 4 d.f., p = <.001 C = .499				χ^2 = 4 d.f., p = n.s. C = .216			
Camp Drake (N)	(N-37)	(N-11)	(N-10)	(N-58)	(N-48)	(N-25)	(N-6)	(N-79)
Positive	94.6	90.9	50.0	86.2	89.6	68.0	16.7	77.2
Neutral	5.4	9.1	50.0	13.8	10.4	28.0	50.0	19.0
Negative	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	33.3	33.8
	χ^2 = *2 d.f., p = <.001 C = .452				χ^2 = 2 d.f., p = <.001 C = .415			

*In calculating Chi-square for the Camp Drake samples it was necessary to combine the frequencies for the Neutral and Negative categories in order to achieve an adequate frequency in all cells.

For three of the four samples, wards who responded "Positive" on the Attitude Toward Camp scale, also tended to respond "Optimistic" on the Perception of Program Value scale, while those who were "Negative" also tended to be "Pessimistic." The one exception is the November sample at Camp Carson where the "Pessimistic" wards tended to respond more "Positive" than would be expected.

There were no consistent significant relationships found between the responses on the Perception of Program Value scale and any of the personal characteristics variables for either sample at either camp.

In summary, the data presented has shown that the two scales each show significant differences in ward attitude toward the camp experience between the two camps for each periodic sample. The differences shown do not appear related to any of the personal and background characteristics of the wards, except possibly for the Attitude Toward Camp scale at Camp Drake in February in relation to Ethnic Background. For three of the four samples the two scales were highly correlated with each other, although no such relationship was found for the November sample at Camp Carson. Since no significant differences were found between the two camps upon the personal and background characteristics used, it therefore seems safe to assume that the responses of the wards upon the two scales are a true reflection of differential camp experiences. That is, differences between the responses of wards in each camp are most likely related to differences between the camps on factors to be found in each camp milieu.

STAFF EVALUATIONS OF WARD STATUS AND INFLUENCE AMONG PEERS

In February and in May the staff at each camp were asked to complete a short form for each ward indicating: 1) the extent of the staff member's acquaintance with the ward, 2) the degree to which he perceived the ward to be accepted as a leader among his peers, a follower or a loner, 3) the type of influence the staff member felt that the ward exerted upon other wards (ranging from "Always Good" to "Always Bad"), and 4) the extent to which the ward was perceived as having made a "less delinquent" or "more delinquent" change in general behavior and attitude since his arrival in camp.[6]

Where a staff member indicated that he had contact with a ward less than once a week, or that he was unacquainted with the ward, any ratings by him of that ward were not recorded. Similarly no ratings were recorded for wards who had been in camp less than one month at the time the ratings were made. The ratings received by each ward upon each of the three judgemental items: Peer Group Status, Peer Group Influence and Delinquency Orientation, were averaged and the obtained averages were then dichotomized at the mean for each sample independently. Thus each ward left in the samples was given overall ratings of "High" or "Low" on Peer Group Status, "Good" or "Bad" on Peer Group Influence, and "Delinquent" or "Non-Delinquent" on Delinquency Orientation.

The process of eliminating all wards from the sample who had spent less than one month in camp or who were otherwise not rated by at least two staff members reduced the size of each sample as shown in Appendix A.

Since no single staff member rated all the boys, nor was any single ward rated by all staff members, it was not possible to make a valid esimate of interrater reliability.

Intercorrelations among the three ratings are shown in Table 6.

---

[6] See Appendix E.

Table 6

Intercorrelations[a] Among Three Staff Rating Variables, February and May Samples

Sample	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	Peer Influence	Delinquency Orientation	Peer Influence	Delinquency Orientation
February				
Peer Status	-.206	-.021	.356	.255
Peer Influence	-	.730	-	.892
May				
Peer Status	-.049	-.094	.196	.290
Peer Influence	-	.616	-	.628

[a] ϕ coefficient

At both camps in both months the camp staff members tended to attribute "Good" or "Bad" peer influence to those wards whom they perceived as having developed respectively, "Non-delinquent" or "Delinquent" tendencies since coming to camp. Staff judgements of Peer Status, however, were relatively uncorrelated with either Peer Influence or Delinquency Orientation. The relationship between staff evaluations of a ward as being a "Good" influence and having developed "Non-delinquent" tendencies since arrival in camp and vice versa, would seem to define a single dimension of what may be called: staff approval-disapproval, which is unrelated at either camp to their perceptions of the ward's status among his peers.

When the three staff ratings were analyzed in terms of the personal characteristics of the wards for each camp sample, no consistent significant relationships were found except for Ethnic Background and Admission Status. The analyses suggest that at Camp Carson, in both months, the staff tended to identify non-Caucasians as having higher status among their peers and Caucasians as having relatively lower status, while at the same time rating non-Caucasians as more Delinquently-oriented and Caucasians as less Delinquently-oriented (staff was predominantly Caucasian at both camps). The same staff tended to identify First Admission wards as both exercising a "Good" peer influence and as less Delinquent-oriented than those with prior admission status. All of these relationships were significant at the .05 level or better. No similar relationships were found for Camp Drake in either month.

Only the February samples at both camps received both the Michigan Questionnaire and staff evaluations. It was hypothesized that staff approval would most likely be given to those wards who responded "Positive" on the Attitude Toward Camp Scale and/or on the Perception of Program Value Scale. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 7:

Table 7

Staff Ratings of Peer Status, Peer Influence and Delinquent Orientation by Attitude Toward Camp and Perception of Program Value, Camp Carson and Camp Drake, February Sample

	Attitude Toward Camp Scale		Perception of Program Value	
Staff Ratings:	Camp Carson	Camp Drake	Camp Carson	Camp Drake
Peer Status	$-.330^{*}$	-.185	-.282+	-.029
Peer Influence	$.485^{**}$	$.326^{+}$	$.253^{+}$	$.296^{+}$
Delinq. Orient.	$.316^{*}$	$.364^{*}$	$.244^{+}$	$.362^{*}$

Ø coefficient significance: + = $p < .10$; * = $p < .05$; ** = $p < .01$

The "Neutral" and "Negative" frequencies were combined for each scale due to the relatively small numbers in those categories at Washington Ridge.

As expected, the staff at both camps have tended to give approval, in terms of rating wards as having "Good" peer influence and tending toward "Non-delinquency", to those wards who held the more positive attitudes toward the camp program upon the two scales. Conversely, the staff at Camp Carson tended to assign higher peer status to those wards showing "Neutral/Negative" scores upon the two scales. This latter tendency was not apparent at Camp Drake, however. The intercorrelations for Camp Drake, however, should be considered with considerable caution due to the relatively small number of wards who scored in the "Neutral/Negative" range upon both the Attitude Toward Camp and the Perception of Camp Value Scales in February. Since nearly all the Camp Drake wards indicated "Positive" attitude and perception upon the scales, there is little possibility for the operation of chance variation within each scale.

In general, those wards for whom the staff at both camps showed approval ("Good" peer influence and "Non-delinquent" ratings) tended to be those who responded with the more "Positive" attitudes toward the camp program. These wards, however, were less often perceived by the staffs as holding "High" status among the other wards. At Camp Carson, approved wards tended significantly to be Caucasian, while wards perceived to have "High" peer status were primarily non-Caucasians. This is in accord with the previous finding that non-Caucasians tended to consistently maintain more "Neutral" and "Negative" attitudes toward the camp program at Camp Carson than did Caucasians. The available data suggest a similar relationship at Camp Drake, but the distribution of scores upon the two scales do not allow sufficient variation for its verification there.

THE CAMP MILIEUX, WARD REACTIONS AND PAROLE REVOCATION

Throughout the previous analyses, major emphasis has been placed upon differential aspects of the two camp milieux as they relate to administrative philosophy and orientation, staff attitudes and behavior, and ward reaction to staff treatment policies. Wide variation between the treatment policies and practices at the two camps has been shown to coincide with findings from other studies in which such factors as staff morale, ward behavior and ward attitudes were highly correlated with characterization of facilities along a "permissive-guidance" vs. "controlled-training" continuum. Ward responses to questionnaire items generally support the findings of these other studies in showing more positive reception and appreciation of the staff and the camp program at Camp Drake and, conversely, more negative reactions to the staff and program at Camp Carson.

The various categories of staff policy and practice studied have constituted most of what might be called the "formal" treatment aspects of the two camps. That is, the focus has been upon the intentional and planned elements of the camp programs. At each camp it is these formal elements which are supposed to have the major rehabilitative impact upon wards, and it is precisely the differential approach to these same elements which most distinguishes the program at each of the camps. It might be expected, therefore, that such basic differences in approach would lead to some reflected difference in rehabilitative effect upon wards exposed to the treatment program at one camp as compared to those exposed to the program at the other camp, assuming the basic homogeneity of the wards sent to both camps. This expectation is not supported by the data concerning parole revocation, however!

The 1963 Camps Parole Cohort

At the end of March, 1965, all wards paroled from the CYA Youth Conservation camps in 1963 had the possibility of having remained on parole a minimum of fifteen months from date of release from camp. The overall parole violation rate for each of the camp parole cohorts is shown in Table 8:

Table 8
Parole Violation Rates of Camp Parolees, 1962 and 1963 Cohorts

Camp	1962		1963	
	No.	Violation Rate	No.	Violation Rate
Camp Anza	129	.310	149	.302
Camp Benton	216	.343	239	.351
Camp Carson	133	.338	169	.355
Camp Drake	162	.296	193	.342
Total	640	.310	750	.340

It can be seen that the 1963 Camp Anza parolees have a slightly lower parole violation rate than do the 1962 parolees from the same camp, while the other three camps cohorts for 1963 all show slightly higher parole violation rates than in 1962. Although the violation rate for the wards paroled from Camp Anza is somewhat lower than for wards from the three other camps in 1963, no overall significant differences in violation rate between camps was shown by Chi-square. The violation rate for the total camps cohort was slightly higher for the 1963 parolees than for the 1962 parolees, but the differences between the two cohorts was not significant.

In the report on Phase 1 of this project, on the basis of data from the 1962 camps parole cohort, the hypothesis was presented that: "any rehabilitative effect of the camp experience...is differentially affective (either positively or negatively) in relation to particular types of wards exposed to different camp milieux." This hypothesis was based on the finding that different types of wards tended to do better on parole when released from certain camps than did wards in the same category released from other camps, or than did other types of wards released from the same camp. (3, p. 40) An analysis of the 1963 cohort data has failed to confirm this previous finding. When the 1963 cohort data is subjected to the same types of analysis used in relation to the 1962 cohort, a significant interaction is found in relation to only one characteristics variable, Juvenile court commitment, at one camp, Camp Carson ($\chi^2 = 8.66$, 3 d.f. $p < .01$). The significance is in a negative direction, that is, the Juvenile court commitments show a higher recidivism rate when released from Camp Carson than do Juvenile court commitments released from the other camps, and a higher recidivism rate than do Criminal court commitments released from the same camp. Since, however, neither of the Court of Commitment categories was shown to be significant for the 1962 cohort, while none of the characteristics variables which were significant for the 1962 cohort appear significant in relation to the 1963 cohort, no generalization concerning a relationship between the ward characteristics examined and parole violation rates can be supported.

The Periodic Samples

The parole violation rates for parolees among the wards in the February, May and November samples at each of the two study camps are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

Parole Violation Rates for Parolees Among the February, May and November Samples at Camp Carson and Camp Drake, 1963

Sample	February		May		November	
	No.	Percent Violated	No.	Percent Violated	No.	Percent Violated
Camp Carson	59	.390	73	.397	58	.396
Camp Drake	53	.321	70	.271	72	.375

At Camp Carson the parole violation rate shows little fluctuation between samples, with all three rates somewhat higher than the rate for the entire 1963 camp cohort. At Camp Drake, on the other hand, the violation rate from sample to sample varies rather widely with the mean rate for all three samples slightly less than the rate for the entire camp cohort. None of the differences in violation rate between parolees from each camp at any one of the periods were found to be statistically significant at the .05 confidence level. Any of the differences in violation rate shown in Table 9 should therefore, be considered within the range of random variation.

The differences in parole violation rate between the various samples from each camp and the 1963 parole cohorts from the same camps raise some questions concerning the representativeness of each of the samples in relation to their respective total parole cohorts.

At Camp Carson particularly, more than half of the wards in the total cohort were included in one or more of the three samples, yet the recidivism rate for all three samples, as noted, is uniformly higher than the rate for the cohort. This implies that the rate for wards in the

Camp Carson cohort not included in the samples must have been somewhat lower than that found for the total cohort. In a somewhat similar manner at Camp Drake the figures imply that the non-sample wards in that camp's total cohort must show a rate which is median to those shown for the February-May samples and the November sample.

Any explanation of these variations in violation rate between cohort and samples must remain hypothetical, but it should be pointed out that the only known difference in treatment distinguishing the sample wards from the non-sample wards is simply that one group was subjected to research data gathering procedures while the other was not. It is also possible, of course, that fairly marked but unknown changes occurred within the milieux at each camp which effected a difference in violation rate between wards who were resident in a camp during the early part of the year as compared to wards resident in the latter part of the year.

Whatever the reasons for the observed differences, they do not seriously impair the relevance of the samples for the particular purposes of this study, particularly where the focus of interest is upon the impact of the camp experience upon the individual ward and its effect upon his subsequent behavior. Thus, this paper is more concerned with finding consistent patterns of relationship (if such exist) between factors in the background and experience of the wards which distinguish those who subsequently became parole violators from those who did not become parole violators, not in whether some particular proportion of parole violators is maintained in each sample.

It was with this particular end in view -- finding consistent patterns of relationship between elements in the camp milieux and the experiences of the wards which are related to their subsequent behavior on parole, that the various measures of ward reaction, attitude and adjustment used in this study were examined in relation to the ward's status on parole at fifteen months from the date of his release from camp. The wards concerned in the following comparisons are only those who were released to parole from camp and who had been in camp at least one month prior to filling out a questionnaire or being rated by the staff.

Parole violation and Michigan Questionnaire Responses: Ward responses to each of the individual items used in the topical analyses section of this paper were compared for parole violators and non-violators, from the February and November samples at each camp. Of the 80 comparisons made only four were found to be significant at the .05 level (chi-square). This is exactly what would be expected from simple random variation. Since no pattern of consistent relationship was observed in relation to any one of the items at either camp, it must be concluded that although responses to most of the items highly differentiate in-camp attitudes of the wards, these attitudes have little relationship to, or effect upon, post-release parole behavior as measured by parole revocation or discharge from a suspended status (parole violation).

Parole Violation and the Two Attitude Scales: Since there was no observed relationship between parole behavior and the individual items, it is only to be expected that the scales composed of some of those individual items would fail to reveal any significant predictive power in relation to parole behavior. Only on the Perception of Effectiveness of Camp Program scale at Camp Drake in November was a Chi-square value approaching significance (.06 level) found. But this could be considered as a consequence of chance, since the relationship was not significant in the other sample.

Parole Violation and Staff Ratings: The relationship between parole violation and each of the three staff ratings on Peer Status, Peer Influence and Delinquent Orientation for the February and May samples at each camp are shown in Table 12.

Table 10

Violation Rates and Camp Staff Ratings on Peer Status, Peer Influence and Delinquency Orientation for the February and May Samples, Camp Carson and Camp Drake

Rating	Camp Carson		Camp Drake	
	February	May	February	May
Peer Status				
High	.385	.467	.250	.207
Low	.318	.360	.524	.345
Peer Influence				
Good	.261	.261	.467	.433
Bad	.440	.531[a]	.364	.107[b]
Delinquency Orientation				
Non-Delinquent	.267	.324	.412	.324
Delinquent	.500	.517	.400	.190

[a] Chi-square significance: $P < .05$ (df = 1).

[b] Chi-square significance: $P < .01$ (df = 1).

Although only the two sets of ratings for Peer Influence in May for each camp show any significance, a differential tendency for the Camp Carson staff to rate more realistically than the Camp Drake staff is apparent. That is, those wards which the Camp Carson staff selected as "Good" and/or "Non-Delinquent" in both months have markedly lower violation rates than those selected as "Bad" and/or "Delinquent". On the other hand, the Camp Drake staff in both months tended to designate as "Good" and/or "Non-Delinquent" wards showing higher violation rates than those designated "Bad" and/or "Delinquent". This divergent tendency for each camp is most marked for the Peer Influence ratings, less for the Delinquency Orientation ratings. When the Peer Status ratings are examined for each camp, it can be seen that at Camp Carson, wards rated as having high status show higher recidivism rates, while at Camp Drake they show lower rates. As noted on page 60, the Camp Carson staff tended to see non-Caucasians as having high peer group status, while seeing Caucasians more often as "Good" influences and "Non-Delinquent". This possibly offers a partial explanation of the above tendencies for non-Caucasians at Camp Carson tended to violate parole at a higher rate than did Caucasians. At Camp Drake, however, it is likely that the staff tended to take a less realistic view of the wards, basing their judgements more upon the ward's overt conformity or non-conformity with the program, or perhaps, with what the staff felt to be the ward's amenability to treatment, rather than his actual change in camp. In either case, it is possible that the Camp Carson staff based their ratings upon quite different criteria than did the Camp Drake staff.

CONCLUSION

The analyses presented in this phase of the overall study have shown large and distinct differences in operating philosophy and practice between the two camps selected for comparison. Relative to these differences, the reactions of the wards in each of the two camps have been shown to be highly divergent. In general, wards evinced more positive and favorable attitudes toward the staff and program at the camp which tended to emphasize permissive-guidance types of treatment, and more negative and unfavorable attitudes toward the staff and program at the camp which tended to emphasize controlled-guidance training types of treatment. There is also some evidence (not presented due to problems of comparative reliability) of less in-camp behavior problems at the former camp. The differences in philosophy and operating practice between the two camps, and the ward reactions at each, closely coincide with similar findings from other studies. There is strong evidence therefore, that the differential treatment modes at the two camps strongly affected the in-camp attitudes and behaviors of wards in a differential manner. Thus, the wards at the more permissive /therapeutic-oriented camp tended to respond to that milieu more favorably than did the wards at the more control / training-oriented camp to the milieu which they encountered.

Despite the apparent effect of such differences in staff philosophy and practice upon wards while in camp, there is no indication that the factors studied had any lasting post-release effect upon the wards in terms of their tendency to violate, or not to violate, parole. Thus, the difference in parole violation rate for the two camps was very small. It could be argued that recidivism is too gross a measurement of parole performance and that differences might have appeared if parole performance were measured in terms of community adjustment variables such as employment record, school record, etc. Unfortunately, data relevant to such community adjustment measures are not available.

Perhaps the main lesson of the foregoing analyses is that although "positive" treatment programs clearly seem to elicit a more cooperative and accommodating response from wards while in camp, any assumption that

these in-camp attitudes or behaviors are necessarily carried back by the ward to the community environment and will affect his behavior there must remain subject to question.

APPENDIX A

Relationship Between Populations, Samples and Sub-samples

Throughout this study different types of data were obtained upon different groups of wards at different times. Some matching data is available for entire yearly cohorts, some only for one or two periodic samples, some only for the selected "panel" sample of wards. This has necessitated the use of varying "N's" in presenting various types of data. The purpose of this appendix is to attempt to clarify the relationships between each of the types of cohort populations, sample and sub-samples used and to indicate the data relevant to each.

The theoretic ward population with which the study is concerned is the 1963 Resident cohort, defined as all wards who were resident in either of the two camps between January 1, and December 31, 1963. This is composed of the 1963 Release Cohort (wards released from camp for any reason during the year) plus those wards still in the camp at the end of the year. The Release Cohort is composed of the Parole Cohort (those wards paroled directly from camp during the year) and "Weeded-out" wards who were transferred to other institutions for disciplinary action or other reasons, or who escaped from camp. The numbers of wards in each of these groupings is shown in the following table:

	Camp Carson	Camp Drake	Total
Resident Cohort	288	337	625
Wards in Camp at end of Year	-67	-93	-160
Release Cohort	221	244	465
"Weeded-out" Wards	-52	-51	-103
Parole Cohort	169	193	362

The periodic samples cut across these inclusive cohorts at three points in time for each camp: February, May and November. All of the wards in each of the periodic samples are included in the Resident Cohort, but some of the wards in the November sample are not included in the Release or Parole Cohorts, since they were not released until after December 31, 1963. Since wards spend an average of about five months in camp, there is a certain degree of ward duplication between different periodic samples, particularly between the February and May samples which were only three months apart. These relationships are shown in the following table:

	Camp Carson					Camp Drake				
	Feb.		May		Nov.	Feb.		May		Nov.
Total Sample	64		78		68	59		80		80
Overlap between Samples		15		7			23		4	
No. taking Michigan Questionnaire	64		--		66	58		--		80
No. Rated by Staff	64		78		--	58		77		--
No. of Direct Parolees	59		73		58	53		70		72
No. of Sample in Camp More than one Mo.	48		58		60	39		70		64
No. of Parolees in Camp More than one Mo.	47		55		53	37		61		58

From the above figures it can be calculated that 65.3 percent of the Resident Cohort for Camp Carson, and 57.0 percent of the Resident Cohort of Camp Drake, are included in one or more of the periodic samples.

The longitudinal samples which have been termed "Panels" consist of wards who entered the camps after December 15, 1962 and for whom there was some assurance that they would remain in camp for three months or more. Panel members were selected in four groups for each camp, each group including about 20 wards. The four groups at each camp were selected in February, March, April, and May from among wards who had been admitted since the previous selection date. Since the selection periods for members of the Panel cover the months between the February and May periodic samples, it is obvious that a certain number of Panel members at each camp will be included among the Periodic samples. The degree of overlap between the two types of samples is shown in the following table:

	Camp Carson Panel	Camp Drake Panel
Total No. in Panel	81	82
Total of Panel wards appearing in Periodic Samples	77	59
No. in:		
February sample	20	20
May sample	71	55
November sample	9	8

Members of the Panel at each camp received measuring instruments just after their entry to the camp (Pre) and just prior to their departure to parole (Post). For those who were not paroled directly from camp, some were interviewed and received questionnaires following their transfer to another institution. The types of measurements available upon each are shown in the following table:

	Camp Carson Panel	Camp Drake Panel
Panel Total	81	82
Parolee Total	70	68
Michigan Questionnaires (Pre)	79	81
" " (Post)	60	60
Eynon Questionnaires (Pre)	79	81
" " (Post)	60	56
Interviews (Pre)	20	15
" (Post)	15	4
Special Interviews (Post) with Weeded-out wards	5	1

APPENDIX B

FORM 4 - YA Research
October 2, 1963

CAMP STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

As you may know, the YA Research Division is studying the impact of camps on the long-term adjustment of wards. Your cooperation is needed to determine some important information. We would appreciate your answering this questionnaire to indicate your views about camp programs, relations with boys, and your job satisfaction.

Each member of the camp supervisory staff is being asked to fill out this questionnaire. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. Your individual answers will be seen only by YA Research Division staff. Please don't discuss the questionnaire with anyone who has not finished filling it out. After completing the questionnaire, insert it in the attached envelope and mail it to the YA Research Division.

We think you will find many of the questions interesting. Any comments or ideas which you have will be appreciated: just write them in at the end of the questionnaire form.

Thank you for your cooperation in this research project.

****

We realize that the alternative answers given to some of the questions below may not reflect your exact attitudes. Please choose those answers that come closest to your views.

1) Different institutions and camps for delinquents have different ideas of what their purposes are. Below are a set of statements about purposes. Place a "1" beside the purpose that best summarizes your understanding of the camp program and number the others in order of importance.

______________ Our purpose is to teach boys good work habits, so more of them can get and hold jobs.

______________ Our purpose is to change a boy's social attitudes and values.

______________ Our purpose is to help each boy gain an understanding of the kinds of things that got him into trouble.

______________ Our purpose is to protect the home community for a period of time.

A. Now look over the list and write down the numbers of the two statements which in your opinion best describe what your superintendent thinks are the purposes of this camp. (List in order of importance.)

(1) _____ (2) _____

B. Which two statements are furthest away from what your superintendent thinks are the purposes of this camp? (List statement furthest away first.)

(1) _____ (2) _____

2) A boy walks and is gone for part of a day, or overnight. He returns voluntarily. Read the alternative staff actions listed below, and check the one that seems most preferable.

_______ Try to find out why he left, talk with him about his behavior, and if he shows willingness to improve, give him another chance in the camp program.

_______ Talk to him about it; if he shows a proper attitude, put him back in the program, but have everyone keep an eye on him.

_______ Try to find out why he left, and recommend his transfer to an institution.

3) A boy starts to complain about how he is being treated here. He gets very aggravated and swears at you. He has done this before and you had spoken to him about it. Which of the following would you be most likely to do?

_______ Give him an incident report and a bad grade or writeup.

_______ Tell him that if he keeps it up he'll get a bad grade or writeup.

_______ Listen to him; try and calm him down once more, and talk with him about it.

_______ Other: (Specify.) ______________________________

4) How many of the boys can a staff member realistically expect to change for the better during their camp-stay? (Check one)

_______ None will change for the better.

_______ Few will become better.

_______ About half will change for the better.

_______ Most will change for the better.

5) How many of the boys will become worse during their camp stay? (Check one)

_______ None will become worse.

_______ Few will become worse.

_______ Some will become worse, but most won't

_______ Many will become worse.

6) In each of the following sets of items, A and B, check the one item that seems to come closest to describing what you think your superintendent expects from the staff members here.

A. He expects staff members:

_______ To develop close relationships with the boys, so that we can understand and work with them better.

How do you feel about this?
____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

_______ To be close to the boys, but not so close that our status and authority will be questioned.

How do you feel about this?
____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

_______ To keep fairly distant from the boys so as not to lose our objectivity and authority.

How do you feel about this?
____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

B. He expects staff members:

_______ To maintain order at all times; otherwise the boys will get out of control.

How do you feel about this?
____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

______ To let the boys have freedom to express themselves, but keep a close watch over it.

How do you feel about this?

____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

______ To let the boys set their own limits, except if it gets dangerous; otherwise the boys won't learn to control themselves.

How do you feel about this?

____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

7) It would help a lot if we had more ways of rewarding and praising boys for good behavior. (Check one)

____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

8) The program we have now is about as good as it can be; we don't need any new treatment programs. (Check one)

____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

9) In special cases, each staff person should use his own judgement in handling the boys, rather than following the rules. (Check one)

____ Strongly Agree
____ Agree
____ Unsure
____ Disagree
____ Strongly Disagree

10) Which one of the following statements comes closes to your feelings?

______ Just as long as you do your job well and follow the rules it isn't so important how you feel about the boys.

______ To do a good job it's better for a supervisor to have a feeling for the boys.

______ A supervisor can't do a good job at all without a strong feeling for the boys.

11) In your opinion, should more or fewer boys be considered eligible for the camp program?

More ______ About the same ______ Fewer ______

COMMUNITY RELATIONS:

12) If you were a member of a committee to advise the superintendent of the camp, which of the following statements about boys' contacts with the local community would you approve? (Check one)

_______ The boys here should have more contact and activity in the community.

_______ Present community contacts and activity are enough.

_______ The boys should have less contact and activity with the community.

13) In general, do you think this camp is highly regarded in the community or not? (Check one)

_______ The camp is highly regarded in the community.

_______ Most people don't feel one way or the other about the camp.

_______ Most people think the camp is bad for the community.

14) What appear to be the complaints about the camp by people in the community? (Put a "1" before the most important criticism and a "2" before the next most important.)

_______ Escapes.

_______ Behavior of boys at community events.

_______ The community thinks we're too tough on the boys.

_______ Fear and dislike of the boys.

_______ Dislike of some of the staff.

_______ No apparent complaints.

15) Some juvenile correctional institutions use volunteers from the community to help with parts of the program. Do you think they are (or would be) helpful here? (Check one)

_______ Very helpful

_______ Somewhat helpful

_______ Do not or would not make any real difference in the program.

_______ May often create problems for us.

STAFF VIEWS:

16) How satisfied are you with your chances for advancement here? (Check one)

_______ Not at all satisfied with my chances for advancement.

_______ Little satisfied.

_______ Fairly satisfied with my chances for advancement.

_______ Very well satisfied.

_______ I don't care about my chances for advancement.

17) How does this place compare with other camps or institutions in which you have worked? (Check one)

	A Comparison with Other Camp		B Comparison with Other Institution
_______	Much better than most.	_______	Much better than most.
_______	Better than most.	_______	Better than most.
_______	About the same as most.	_______	About the same as most.
_______	Somewhat poorer than most.	_______	Somewhat poorer than most.
_______	Much poorer than most.	_______	Much poorer than most.
_______	Have not worked in other camp.	_______	Have not worked in other institution.

18) List the things you like about your job.

____

____

____

19) List the things you dislike about your job.

____

____

____

Personal data. In these questions we would like to know a little about your background. We are not interested in your individual answers, but only in the general pattern for all supervisory personnel. Please answer all questions.

20) How old are you?

1 ______ less than 25
2 ______ 25-29
3 ______ 30-34
4 ______ 35-39
5 ______ 40-44
6 ______ 45-49
7 ______ 50-54
8 ______ 55-59
9 ______ 60-64
10 ______ 65 and over

21) Education (check the number of years of school you have completed)

______ 7-9 years

______ 10-11 years

______ completed high school

______ 1-3 years of college

______ completed college

______ graduate study

Have you taken any night school or extension courses? ______Yes ______No

If so, what courses?

If you went to college, what was your major field of study? ______________

22) What is your present marital status?

______Single
______Married
______Divorced
______Widowed
______Separated

Check your agency: YA ______ Forestry ______

Date questionnaire was completed:
Day ________ Month __________

Please indicate any comments or feelings you may have about answering the above questions.

____

____

____

____

APPENDIX C

1963 RESEARCH STUDY

Your answers to these questions will be seen only by the research people at the Youth Authority in Sacramento. No one else here or anywhere will see them. Please give your honest opinions.

1. What month did you come here? __________________ (Month).

2. What kind of work does your father, or whoever supports your family, do? (Specify) ____

3. We would like your opinion about these things, as you see them here. Check each one on whether you agree, disagree or are unsure.

   a. There are not enough things to do during free time.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   b. We are not allowed to smoke enough.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   c. The food does not taste as good as what I'm used to.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   d. Some adults here are too strict.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   e. Boys should be able to suggest changes in work programs, smoking rules and activities.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   f. The adults here are pretty fair.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   g. Adults here are not strict enough with certain boys.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   h. There are too many boys here who push other boys around.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

   i. Some boys can get away with too much.
   Agree _____ Disagree _____ Unsure _____

4. Have you ever broken a rule here? Yes _____ No _____

5. How many times in the last two weeks have you talked to your counselor for at least a few minutes? __________

6. When you talk with your counselor, which one of these things do you talk about most? (Check one only)

____ 1. Home visits
____ 2. Parole or release date
____ 3. Change in work assignment
____ 4. Punishment or losing privileges
____ 5. Why I get into trouble here
____ 6. What I will do after I am released
____ 7. How I get along with my family
____ 8. Why I got into trouble in the past
____ 9. Personal problems that bother me

7. Are there any boys you know here who try to help other boys stay out of trouble? Yes ____ No ____

How many can you think of offhand? ______________

Who are the three boys who try to help others most? (Write in first and last names)

__________________________ __________________

____

8. Are there any boys you know here who get other boys into trouble? (Think of those boys in the dorm, on your work detail, or that you are with during recreation.) Yes ____ No ____

9. What do you think about this place now? Is it better than you expected, or worse than you expected? (Check one)

____ A lot better than I expected
____ Better than I expected
____ Worse than I expected
____ A lot worse than I expected

10. Some boys who get into trouble are sent to one place and some are sent to another. If you had your choice to come to this camp, or to go to an institution such as Preston, YTS, DVI, or Soledad, which would you choose?

Come here ____ Go to an institution ____ (Which one? ________)

11. Have you been helped here to prepare for future employment you would like to have? (Check one)

____ I have received a lot of help
____ I have received some help
____ I have received little help
____ I have not received any help in preparing for future employment

12. Did you have trouble getting along with the guys here? (Check one)

____ Very much
____ Fairly much
____ Some
____ Not much
____ Very little

13. Supposing you had a friend back home who was committing some burglaries and car thefts. He was caught once and put on probation. He got caught again. Do you think it would straighten him up if he were sent to this camp?

It probably would ____ It probably wouldn't ____

If he were sent to an institution?

It probably would ____ It probably wouldn't ____

14. a) How much would you say that your stay here has helped you? (Check one)

____ A great deal
____ Quite a bit
____ Some but not much
____ Very little
____ None

b) If it has helped you, is it mostly because (Check one):

____ I have learned my lesson
____ I have learned something about myself and why I get into trouble
____ I have gotten work experience

15. Do you usually hang around here with several guys, a few, mostly with one guy, or with none? (Check one)

____ Four or more guys
____ Two or three guys
____ One guy
____ None

16. Did you get a chance here to learn any type of work you were really interested in? Yes ____ No ____

17. Boys who are here think different things about themselves. Check the statement that comes closest to what you think about yourself. (Check one)

____ Someone who made a mistake
____ Juvenile Delinquent
____ Someone who doesn't let anyone push him around
____ Someone who knows what the score is and how to play it cool
____ Someone who is trying to straighten out

18. What do your family and friends back home think of this place? Do they think it is: (Check one)

____ A place that helps boys in trouble
____ A place to send boys who get into trouble
____ A place to punish boys for something wrong they did

19. Think about yourself now - what do you think about this place? (Check one)

____ A place that helps guys in trouble
____ A place to send guys who get into trouble
____ A place to punish guys for something wrong they did

20. Most places like this have different groups of guys who stick closely together and don't have much to do with the other boys. How many groups like this does your dorm have? (Check one)

____ There are three or more groups
____ There are two groups
____ There is one group
____ There are no groups at all

21. Some guys say that you have to be pretty careful about what you say or do around the other boys here, or else they may give you a rough time. What do you think about this? (Check one)

____ You have to be very careful about what you say and do around the other guys
____ You have to be somewhat careful
____ You don't have to be careful

22. What do you think your chances of staying out of trouble with the law will be after you leave here? (Check one)

____ Very good chance
____ Good chance
____ My chances are about 50-50
____ Chances are not too good
____ Chances are poor

23. Considering everything, how do you like it here in camp? (Check one)

____ It's all right
____ It's not too bad
____ It's pretty bad

24. How well do you feel that the men who run this camp understand your problems and needs? (Check one)

____ They usually understand my problems and needs
____ They sometimes understand them
____ They don't know much about them

25. If you had a problem, something you wanted to get off your chest, who would you go to first? (Check one)

____ A counselor
____ The camp superintendent
____ One of the guys here
____ A workcrew foreman
____ Some other man here
____ No one here

26. How well do you personally like most of the men who run this camp? (Check one)

____ Very much
____ Pretty much
____ So-so
____ Not so much
____ Not at all

27. In general, do you think of yourself as having gotten a square deal here at camp? (Check one)

____ Yes, in most ways I have
____ In some ways yes, in others no
____ No, on the whole I haven't

28. How many of the men who run this camp take a personal interest in the guys? (Check one)

____ All of them
____ Most of them
____ About half of them
____ A few of them or one
____ None of them

29. Suppose the superintendent decided to form a group among the guys here called a camp council. The group would have the power to decide such things as work assignments, recreational programs, and some other

problems as they come up. What three boys would you say are respected enough so they would be chosen to be on the council?

____________________ ____________________

____

30. Would you be in favor of such a council? Yes ____ No ____

31. Who are your best friends here in camp?

____________________ ____________________

____

Your name ______________________________
First Last

Form 2B
(Supplemental)

X-1 Do the guys here make it hard on the boys who take religion seriously?
Yes ____ No ____

X-2 What adult here knew you the best? (Check one only)
Dorm Supervisor ____ Work Supervisor ____ Trade Instructor ____
Teacher ____ Counselor ____ Other (specify)______________
Nobody ____

X-3 With what staff member here did you share good news? (Check one only)
Dorm Supervisor ____ Work Supervisor ____ Teacher ____
Counselor ____ Social Worker ____ Trade Instructor ____
Other (specify) ____ Nobody ____

X-4 With what adult could you best talk about personal problems? (Check one only)
Dorm Supervisor ____ Work Supervisor ____ Counselor ____
Teacher ____ Social Worker ____ Psychologist ____ Chaplain ____
Trade Instructor ____ Other (specify) ____________ Nobody ____

X-5 Who is the one who helped you the most? (Check one only)
Dorm Supervisor ____ Work Supervisor ____ Counselor ____
Teacher ____ Trade Instructor ____ Social Worker ____ Chaplain ____
Cook ____ Other (specify) ____________ Nobody ____

X-6 How many staff members knew you?
All of them ____ Most of them ____ Half of them ____
Only a few of them ____ None of them ____

X-7 Do you think that most of the staff members did what they would to help you?
All of them ____ Most of them ____ Half of them ____
Only a few of them ____ None of them ______

X-8 Do the staff members here try to make the guys think they are delinquents?
None do ____ One or two do ____ Most do ____

X-9 Pick one of the following programs that did you the most good:
Work assignment ____ Trade training ____ Recreation and athletics ____
Dorm life ____ Religious services ____ School ______
Counseling ____ Other (specify) ________________________

X-10 Do you think the religious program has helped you?
Helped a lot ____ Helped some ____ Helped a little ____
No help ____

APPENDIX D

1963 Research Study - Form 1B

THE WAY I LOOK AT THINGS

This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. The right answer for you is the way you look at things. Make sure you answer each question the way you really think. Check the answer which best expresses how you look at things.

1. The best way to make it here is to be slick.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

2. At the present time, do you think of yourself as someone who had got a raw deal?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

3. Now that you have been up here, do you feel ready to make a fresh start?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

4. The best way to make it here is to act tough.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

5. Do the other boys make it hard or easy on a guy for following the rules here?
Very hard ___ Hard ___ Not sure___ Easy___ Very easy___

6. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to make friends with adults.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

7. This seems to be a place where a guy waits around for others to tell him what do do.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

8. Now that you are soon to leave here, do you see yourself as a person who has been like a private at a military school?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

9. Have any of the other boys picked on you here?
Most of the time___ Some of the time___ Very little___ None of the time___

10. Most of what you learn here is learned from the other boys.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

11. At the present time do you think of yourself as someone who will straighten out?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

12. If I keep out of trouble on the outside, it will be because of what I learned here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

13. I think that I am a better guy because I have been here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

14. Now that you are soon to leave here, do you feel happy?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

15. Did some adult help you by taking an interest in you while you were here?
Helped me a lot___ Helped me some___ Helped me a little___
Didn't help me___

16. Have you ever broken rules here?
Quite a few___ A few___ One or two___ None___

17. Were you ever sent to lockup or given a bad write-up here?
Lots of times___ Several times___ Once or Twice___ Never___

18. Do you see yourself as a guy who is paying his debt to society?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

19. Do you think of yourself as someone who won't let anybody push him around?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

20. Now that you will soon be leaving here, do you feel hopeful for the future?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

21. Now that you will soon be leaving here, do you feel untroubled?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

22. Do you think of yourself as someone who made a mistake?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

23. Have the other guys here ever been angry at you because you wouldn't "mess up" with them?
Most of the time___ Some of the time___ Very little___ None of the time___

24. I would agree to stay at this place an extra month.
Sure would___ Maybe___ Don't know___ Probably not___ Sure wouldn't___

25. This seems to be a place where a guy can lose his temper easily.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

26. Do you think of yourself as someone who wishes he hadn't done the thing that got you up here?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

27. This seems to be a place where a guy will never get a break.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

28. Do you like the staff members with whom you have come in contact here?
Most of them___ Some of them___ One or two of them___ None of them___

29. Did watching your step help you while you were here?
Helped me a lot___ Helped me some___ Helped a little___ Didn't help me___

30. Now that you will soon be leaving here, do you see yourself as a person who has been like a patient in a hospital?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

31. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to talk about yourself to some adult.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

32. Did the staff members here really try to help you?
Most of the time___ Some of the time___ Very little___ None of the time___

33. The best way to make it here is not to rat.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

34. If a guy can get along here, he can get along on the outside.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

35. I have learned more bad things during my time here than I would have in the same time outside.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

36. I like myself better now than when I first cam here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

37. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to run errands for the staff members.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

38. I am able to control my temper better than before I came here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

39. If a friend of mine got into trouble, I would want him to be sent here.
Sure would___ Maybe___ Don't know___ Probably not___ Sure wouldn't___

40. If I felt I was going to get into real trouble after I leave here, I would ask to be sent back here before it happened.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

41. While he is here, the average guy learns how to get along better with other people.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

42. It really helps a guy to be up here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

43. The average guy gets a chance to improve himself up here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

44. Now that you will soon be leaving here, do you feel friendly?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

45. If I felt I were going to get into real trouble after I leave here, I would ask to be sent back there before it happened.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

46. Now that you will soon be leaving here, do you see yourself as a delinquent?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

47. Now that you will soon be leaving here, do you see yourself now as a person who has been like a pupil at a boarding school?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

48. While he's here, the average guy finds out why he got into trouble.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

49. I got a bum rap by being sent here.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

50. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to play it straight.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

51. The food here is clean:
Most of the time___ Some of the time___ Very little___ None of the time___

52. The program here is:
Very good___ Good___ 50/50___ Poor___ Very poor___

53. My stay here has helped me.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

54. If you were the superintendent here, would you make any changes in the way this place is run?
Quite a few___ A few___ One or two___ None___

55. The best way to make it here is to outsmart the staff members.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

56. This seems to be a place where a guy must obey a lot of phony rules.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

57. Regardless of what they say, the best way to get along here is to try to figure yourself out.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

58. Sending me here was a good deal for me.
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

59. Now that you are about to leave here, do you see yourself as a delinquent?
Strongly agree___ Agree___ Undecided___ Disagree___ Strongly disagree___

60. Have any guys tried to "shine you on" or "stone you out" up here?
Most of the time___ Some of the time___ Very little___ None of the time___

61. How many weeks have you been here?______

APPENDIX E

February 1963

CAMP IMPACT STUDY:

STAFF RATING INSTRUCTIONS

The Youth Authority Research Division has begun a study of the ways in which boys are affected by different programs at institutions and camps. Your assistance is needed in rating the behavior and attitudes of boys during their camp stay.

On the attached list are boys being included in the research study. Please consider each boy and in Column A indicate how familiar you are with this boy:

A. I have talked with or closely observed this boy:

1) Daily or almost daily
2) Two or three times a week
3) About once a week
4) Two or three times a month
5) Hardly know the boy

If you have marked choices 1), 2), 3), or 4) for a boy, please continue rating him on each of the following three items:

B. In general, what seems to be the peer group status of this boy among boys with whom he is usually in contact?

1) An informal leader
2) A follower, with leadership abilities
3) A loner, but accepted by boys
4) A loner, not accepted by boys
5) A follower, accepted by boys
6) A follower, not accepted by boys

C. What kind of influence does this boy seem to have on other boys?

1) Always good influence
2) Usually good influence
3) Sometimes good, sometimes bad influence
4) Usually bad influence
5) Always bad influence
6) No influence, keeps to himself

D. To what extent has this boy become more delinquent or less delinquent in his general behavior and attitude since he arrived in camp?

1) Much less delinquent
2) Slightly less delinquent
3) Unchanged
4) Slightly more delinquent
5) Much more delinquent

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. California Youth Authority. Data Processing System.

2. Grusky, Oscar. Treatment Goals and Organizational Behavior: A Study of an Experimental Prison Camp. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1957.

3. Roberts, Chester F., Jr. Rehabilitative Influences in California Youth Conservation Camps, Phase I: The California Youth Conservation Camps and Their Wards. State of California, Department of the Youth Authority, Division of Research, Research Report No. 43, May, 1965.

4. Vinter, Robert D. and Janowitz, Morris. The Comparative Study of Juvenile Correctional Institutions: A Research Report. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan School of Social Work. December, 1961 (mimeographed).

5. Vinter, Robert D. and Lind, Roger M. Staff Relationships and Attitudes in a Juvenile Correctional Institution. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan School of Social Work, June, 1958.

6. Weber, George H. Report, Consultation on Public Youth Work Camps. Cited in Gary, Lee J. "History of the Work Camp as a Method of Treating Delinquents." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXII, 5 (October, 1962).

7. Wilkins, Leslie. Social Deviance: Social Policy, Action and Research. Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.